DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 692 UD 020 759

AUTHOR Cervenka, Edward J.
TITLE Project BUILD: "Bilingual Understanding Incorporates Learning Disabilities"--An ESEA Title VII Basic Bilingual Education Program. Final Evaluation Report, 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Community School District 4, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 30 Nov 79
GRANT G007604878
NOTE 103p.: Some pages of the Appendices may be marginally legible due to broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement: *Bilingual Education: Elementary Education: Federal Programs: *Learning Disabilities: Program Descriptions: Program Effectiveness: *Spanish Speaking: *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Education Act 1968: Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII: *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This is a one year evaluation of Project BUILD, a program combining bilingual and special education and providing services to 100 children from grades 1-6 in East Harlem, New York. Section I of the evaluation gives descriptive and background information on this special program for the bilingual learning disabled. Section II sets forth the evaluation plan, describing procedures used to measure pupil academic achievement, the program's educational processes, and program management. Sections III and IV, the bulk of the report, present, synthesize, and discuss specific evaluation findings. Findings relating to pupil achievement are presented mainly in statistical tables. Interview, observational, questionnaire, and other findings pertaining to Project BUILD's educational processes and to program management are described comprehensively. Finally, Section V contains a summary of program accomplishments, commentary on Project BUILD's future, and recommendations for strengthening the program. Appended to the report are copies of questionnaires used in the evaluation and a list of procedures employed in the Bond and Singer method of analysis (also used in the evaluation). (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190692

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
PROJECT BUILD

"Bilingual Understanding Incorporates Learning Disabilities"

An ESEA Title VII Basic Bilingual Education Program

1978-79

Function # 97603-97604

Grant Award # G007604878

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
NYC Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for:

Community School Board 4
NYC Community School District 4
319 East 117th Street
New York, New York 10035

Prepared by:

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Evaluation Consultant
617 West End Avenue, Suite 9-A
New York, New York 10024

November 30, 1979

UD020759

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOREWORD

If the reader wishes a condensed overview of the evaluation study findings and conclusions, the evaluator suggests that Sections IV and V be read first. Otherwise, the reader may find it helpful to keep in mind the evaluator's logic in organizing the contents of this report on Project BUILD during the 1978-79 school year.

Section I, Program Description, gives descriptive and background information which places the evaluation study in context.

Section II, Evaluation Design, sets forth the evaluation plan for the program this year, as it was given in the Program's Continuation Application, in the evaluator's Outline of Proposed Evaluation and in other program documents which modified the evaluation plan for the 1978-79 school year.

Section III, Evaluation Findings, which constitutes the bulk of the report, presents specific evaluation findings on program objectives relating to pupil achievement, educational processes and program management. With respect to the latter area, the report treats program management structure and processes. The evaluator emphasizes that this study was not designed as an in-depth evaluation of classroom instruction and other remediational activities. Findings relating to pupil achievement are presented mainly in statistical tables, with a minimum of interpretative commentary. Interview, observational, questionnaire and other findings pertaining to Project BUILD's educational processes and to program management are described comprehensively.

Whereas Section III presents a variety of data, derived from different sources and by different means of data collection, Section IV, Discussion and Interpretation of Findings, attempts to synthesize all data previously presented into a coherent whole, which represents the evaluator's best judgement about overall program implementation and effectiveness.

Section V, Conclusion and Recommendations, summarizes program accomplishments, comments on its promise and offers recommendations for strengthening the program in the future.

Appendices to this report contain copies of questionnaires used with school and District administrators, bilingual classroom teachers, Project BUILD staff and bilingual parents. Frequencies and percentages of responses on questionnaire surveys which were too detailed to report in Section III are recorded on the copies of appropriate questionnaires. An appendix is included on the Bond and Singer method of analysis used in this study. Another appendix illustrates some of the items on the self concept test employed.

This evaluation study was a joint undertaking by the program staff and the evaluator. The evaluator wishes to thank the program staff, particularly the Project Director, principals and other school personnel, and District administrators for their cooperation.

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Project BUILD Evaluator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	Foreword	ii
	List of Tables	v
I.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
II.	EVALUATION DESIGN	4
III.	EVALUATION FINDINGS	10
	Pupil Achievement	10
	Reading: English as a Dominant Language	10
	Reading: Spanish as a Dominant Language	14
	Other Areas of Achievement	17
	Self Concept	18
	Program Educational Processes	23
	Pupil Selection	23
	Direct Services	25
	Indirect Services	27
	Staff Development	29
	Curriculum and Materials	30
	Parent Involvement	31
	Program Management	33
IV.	DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	37
	Pupil Achievement	37
	Program Educational Processes	51
	Program Management	56
	Overall Project Implementation and Effectiveness	57
V.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	60
	APPENDICES	66

A. Questionnaire for School and District Administrators
B. Questionnaire for Regular Classroom Teachers
C. Questionnaire for Bilingual Program Staff
D. Parent Questionnaire (English Version)
E. Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test (Sample items from English Answer Booklet)
F. Procedures Employed in Bond and Singer Method

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	English as a Dominant Language Reading Achievement, Inter-American Series, Test of Reading, Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis, Bond and Singer Method	11
2	English as a Dominant Language Reading Achievement, Inter-American Series, Test of Reading, Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis, Pretest-Posttest Method	12
3	Spanish as a Dominant Language Reading Achievement, Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura, Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis, Bond and Singer Method	15
4	Spanish as a Dominant Language Reading Achievement, Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura, Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis, Pretest-Posttest Method	16
5	Self Concept: Program vs. Control Group Comparison, Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test, End-of-the-Year Scores	20
6	Comparison of English-and Spanish-Dominant Pupils, Project and Control Pupils Combined, Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test, End-of-Year Total Scores	22
7	Subgroup of "English-Dominant" Pupils, Grades 1-6, End-of-the-Year Spanish and English Mean Scores, IAS Prueba de Lectura and Test of Reading, Total Grade Equivalent Scores	41
8	English as a Dominant Language Reading Objectives, Extent to which Grades Achieved or Approached Criterion of $P \leq .05$	44
9	Spanish as a Dominant Language Reading Objectives, Extent to Which Grades Achieved or Approached Criterion of $P \leq .05$	46

SECTION I: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Project BUILD (an acronym for "Bilingual Understanding Incorporates Learning Disabilities") was established in September 1976 in New York Community School District 4 (Manhattan's East Harlem) under the provisions of the ESEA Title VII. The 1978-79 school year, the concern of this evaluation study, represents its third year of operation. Project BUILD is an innovative, possibly unique, bilingual education program. This is the case because the Project attempts to combine and apply the methodology and concerns of both special education and bilingual education. Its principal aim is to provide appropriate, supplemental educational and remediational opportunities for bilingual children with learning disabilities. Major activities of the program include:

- Identification and selection of bilingual children who have or may have learning disabilities
- Providing diagnostic evaluations of the psychoeducational functioning of children
- Individualized and small-group educational and therapeutic treatment outside of the regular classroom
- Curriculum and material resources development to support the above activities
- Staff development, through educational and in-service training, of Project staff
- Promoting the understanding of learning disabilities among the bilingual parents of children in the Project and involving such parents in appropriate and supportive educational processes

The Project BUILD staff consists of a Project Director, responsible for overall implementation and management; a Psychological Consultant, responsible for psychological testing,

diagnosis and evaluation of children; a Family Associate who serves as a liaison between the project and parents and community, and who also follows up on the individual children who are treated by external agencies (medical examinations and treatment at local hospitals, clinics, etc.); three Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and three Educational Associates.

Project BUILD provides educational remediational and therapeutic services to 100 children in grades one through six. All children attend locally-supported "Bilingual Centers" (really "sub-schools" or "minischools") at two public schools which provide programs of bilingual instruction, P.S. 72 and P.S. 155, and one non-public school, St. Paul's. Each bilingual center at the two public schools has a special resource learning center -- or lab -- staffed by one Bilingual Learning Disability Specialist and one or two Educational Associates. The Bilingual Learning Disability Specialist assigned to the non-public school has a resource room, but works without the support of an Educational Associate.

Bilingual children with learning disabilities are seen on an individual or small-group basis, depending on their specifically diagnosed needs, for a 45-minute period every Monday through Thursday. Fridays are set aside for staff meetings, planning, administrative and record keeping tasks, materials development, training, conferences with bilingual classroom teachers, etc.

Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists assess and evaluate children's specific strengths and weaknesses and write prescriptive treatment for each individual child. The project's

educational and treatment program is concerned with pupils' language and other academic skills (both in English and Spanish, but principally in their dominant language), with their specific and general learning disabilities (auditory, vocal and visual skills; visual-motor coordination; perceptual development; etc.), and with their personal and social development (e.g., self concept). Project policy is for the staff to discuss diagnoses and prescriptions for children with the regular classroom bilingual teachers so that these teachers may follow up on the instruction and treatment that is given in the Project's resource centers.

SECTION II: EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation design for Project BUILD which was described in the original 1976 Project Application (pp. 66-78) and later mofidifed in the 1976-77 and 1977-78 Continuation Applications remained in effect for the 1978-79 school year but with several major reformulations which are described below.

Pupil Achievement

A major concern of this evaluation was to attempt to document the educational gains made by participating pupils as a result of the Project. Instead of merely testing for pretest-posttest significant improvements, the evaluator attempted to determine if pupils' rates of academic learning had significantly improved while in the program. This evaluation strategy was consistent with that prescribed in the Regulations for ESEA Title VII programs (123.14(b)7(iii)A) for "reading skills in English and in the language other than English."

Since a major emphasis of Project services was to be on pupils' language and reading skills, in English as well as in Spanish, the evaluation design was revised for the 1977-78 and 1978-79 school years to reflect this emphasis. The assessment of educational gains of pupils therefore again focused on English as a dominant language reading and Spanish as a dominant language reading. The areas of educational and related improvement, such as math, "basic skills," "progress in problem areas," or social skills were not to be formally measured. Progress in these areas was to be assessed by other evaluation techniques.

Pupils' dominant language reading achievement in English or Spanish in grades 1 through 6 was to be evaluated by pretest

and posttest administration of the Inter-American Series (IAS) Test of Reading and Prueba de Lectura, Levels, I and II. The "Pre Test" Forms (old Forms CE and CEs) were to be given in the fall and the "Post Test" Forms (old Forms DE and DEs) were to be given at the end of the year. Pupils were to be tested only in their dominant language, i.e., English or Spanish.

For evaluative as well as for diagnostic purposes, all IAS raw total scores and subtest scores were converted to an experimental set of grade equivalent (G.E.) scores which has been developed by the present evaluator over the past six years. These grade equivalent scores are based on published percentile norms for the IAS and on other research relating to the use of the IAS. The Spanish G.E. scores are based primarily on Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican populations, and the English G.E. scores on English-speaking populations in the U.S. (The evaluator acknowledges that some question can legitimately be raised as to whether these norms and their inherent rates of "normal" reading growth can appropriately be applied to Spanish- or English-speaking pupils in New York City, and especially, to such pupils with learning disabilities.)

Pretest and Posttest scores were to be analyzed by the Bond and Singer method (or "historical regression" procedure) to determine if gains made by pupils at each grade level and in the two language dominance groups were attributable to the program or not. Control groups were not to be used in the evaluation as was previously specified, except at the first grade level where the Bond and Singer method was not appropriate. Essentially, the Bond and Singer method treats each pupil as his/her own control.

The 12 evaluation objectives (2 languages X 6 grades = 12 objectives) for dominant language reading took the following general form:

> Instruction and other services provided by the Project will result in pupils' gains in dominant-language reading skills (as measured by the IAS: Test of Reading and Prueba de Lectura), as demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in growth in total grade equivalent scores on each battery, as indicated by comparison of their pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with their average gains of previous years, which are to be computed from their pretest scores.

In essence, these reading objectives required that each dominant language grade group demonstrate an improvement in reading growth rate after beginning the program.

A modification of this procedure was required for first graders since most of them did not receive formal reading instruction prior to this year for which "average gains of previous years" could be computed. However, approximately 20% of the first graders had been retained in grade, making this procedure applicable. For the remaining first graders, the "normal" rate of growth inherent in the grade equivalent scores for these reading tests (i.e., 0.1 grade equivalent per month) was assumed, starting from their actual pretest score, in order to derive an "expected" or "predicted" posttest score. This expected score was then to be compared with the pupil's actual posttest score. (See Appendix F for an account of the procedures employed in the Bond and Singer method).

The evaluation findings of the previous year suggested that the primary impact of Project BUILD may not be on pupils' academic achievement, but on aspects of personality, behavior or socialization. Therefore, it was decided that for this year

a modest attempt would be made to measure Project BUILD's impact on the self concept of participating pupils; the following objective was fomulated:

> By the end of the year Project Build pupils will demonstrate a significant improvement ($P \leq .05$) in self concept as measured by the first three scales of the Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test, as determined by a comparison of total scores of a sample of Project BUILD participants with a sample of non-BUILD bilingual pupils who had previously been diagnosed by the Project BUILD staff as having learning disabilities, but who could not be accomodated by the Project.

Program Educational Processes

Selection

Evaluative data bearing on the effectiveness of Project selection procedures was to be obtained by the evaluators by means of staff interviews, questionnaire survey, examination of Project documents, and review of pupil achievement data.

Direct Services

Documentation and assessment of direct services provided by Project staff to participating pupils was to be provided for by informal observation, staff interviews and questionnaire survey by the evaluators during the spring term.

Indirect Services

Documentation and assessment of indirect services provided by Project staff to other pupils in the three schools was to be based on evaluator interviews and questionnaire survey of school and Project staff.

Staff Development

Attainment of staff development objectives was to be assessed near the end of the spring term by means of staff

interviews and examination of Project Documents relating to training.

Parent Involvement

Attainment of objectives pertaining to parent involvement was to be assessed near the end of the spring term by means of parent questionnaires in English and Spanish and input from staff interviews.

Curriculum and Materials

Attainment of objectives pertaining to curriculum and materials, including development and dissemination activities, was to be assessed during the spring term by means of questionnaire survey of the recipients and users of Project materials. Information from staff interviews was also to be utilized.

Program Management

The evaluator proposed to evaluate program management on the basis of how it affected or may have affcted pupil achievement, and also on how it affected the staff. It was assumed that findings relating to Project BUILD's management structure and processes, when combined with findings relating to pupil achievement, would provide an for a better overall assessment of program implementation and effectiveness.

The evaluation of program management was to utilize the framework and procedures given below as a guide to data collection and organization.

1. Identify the elements which constitute the structure of program management, including external factors which affected this structure. When carried out this procedure results in a comprehensive "organizational chart."

2. Utilize information about the structure of program management to identify and describe program management <u>processes</u>, e.g., leadership, planning, communication, supervision, office operation, etc.

3. Specify for major program management processes how each of these <u>helped</u> to achieve primary project objectives (i.e., pupil achievement) and/or how it <u>hindered</u> such achievement.

4. Specify ways of <u>improving</u> these management processes during the year so that program objectives would be attained, and also lay the foundation for long-term improvement in program management.

The evaluation procedures to be employed in examining management structure and processes included review of program documents, interviews of Project BUILD staff, on-site observation of supervisory activities and staff interaction, and principally, questionnaire surveys of school and district administrators, bilingual classroom teachers, Project BUILD staff and bilingual parents.

SECTION III: EVALUATION FINDINGS

Evaluation findings are presented in this section, mainly in tabular form and with a minimum of commentary. The following section, Discussion and Interpretation of Findings, provides a comprehensive discussion and interpretation of evaluation findings for Project BUILD as a whole during the 1978-79 school year.

Pupil Achievement

Reading: English as a Dominant Language

Table 1 (page 11) gives the results of the Bond and Singer analyses of English as a dominant language reading for Grades 1 - 6, according to the specifications set forth in Section II: Evaluation Design. As is shown in Table 1, a total of 43 valid and useable pairs of pretst and posttest scores on the IAS Test of Reading were obtained for all grades in Project BUILD.

The first graders obtained a substantially higher actual posttest mean score than expected posttest mean score, but the difference was not statistically significant. However, as suggested in Section II, this finding must be disregarded as questionable because the majority of pupils had no previous schooling, and therefore there was no basis for calculating realistic expected reading growth rates and expected posttest scores. The expected posttest scores here merely reflect "normal" (i.e., 0.1 G.E.'s per month) for most first graders and anticipated posttest scores for a small group of first graders who had been retained in grade. The pretest-posttest analysis of the first graders given in Table 2 (page 12) must be regarded as the more definitive analysis of their English reading achievement.

TABLE 1

ENGLISH AS A DOMINANT LANGUAGE: READING ACHIEVEMENT
Inter-American Series, Test of Reading
Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis
Bond and Singer Method

		Actual Posttest Scores			Expected Posttest Scores				
Grade	Level	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	t(d)	p
First	I	10	1.8	889	10	1.5	.365	1.448	.186
Second	II	8	2.5	.884	8	1.8	.464	2.602	.041
Third	II	4	2.7	.726	4	1.9	.695	3.447	.075
Fourth	II	10	3.6	1.032	10	2.7	.771	3.537	.008
Fifth	II	6	2.8	.625	6	3.4	1.164	.994	.377
Sixth	II	5	2.4	.594	5	2.7	.480	1.074	.362

TABLE 2

ENGLISH AS A DOMINANT LANGUAGE: READING ACHIEVEMENT
Inter-American Series, Test of Reading
Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis
Pretest-Posttest Method

		Pretest Scores			Posttest Scores				
Grade	Level	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	t(d)	p
First	I	10	1.2	.116	10	1.8	.889	2.440	.041
Second	II	8	1.5	.338	8	2.5	.884	3.413	.014
Third	II	4	1.8	.645	4	2.7	.726	4.082	.055
Fourth	II	10	2.4	.651	10	3.6	1.032	4.587	.002
Fifth	II	6	3.1	1.121	6	2.8	.625	.560	.395
Sixth	II	5	2.5	.485	5	2.4	.594	.269	.195

The second graders achieved their objective for English reading, obtaining an actual posttest mean of 2.5 (SD = .884) with t = 2.602 and P = .041 as compared to an expected posttest mean of 1.8 (SD = .464).

The third grade obtained an actual posttest mean of 2.7 (SD = .726) with t = 3.447 and P = .075 as compared to an expected posttest mean of 1.9 (SD = .695). This group narrowly missed achieving the desired statistical criterion; however, the fact that only four subjects were involved in this analysis tends to suggest that the achievement of the third graders may be a significant one educationally.

The fourth grade clearly achieved its objective for English reading, scoring an actual posttest mean of 3.6 (SD = 1.032) with t = 3.537 and P = .008 as compared to an expected posttest mean of 2.7 (SD = .771).

The fifth and ~~sixth~~ graders clearly did not achieve their objectives for English reading. Both grades had lower actual posttest means than expected posttest means. This indicates that their <u>rates</u> of reading growth declined during the year, as compared with previous years. However, this decline was not statistically significant.

Table 2 gives a re-analysis of the scores for English as a dominant language reading utilizing a t test comparison of pretest and postttest scores. As is shown on Table 2, grades 1, 2, 3 and 4 demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in mean scores.. The fifth and sixth grades did not show an improvement in mean scores, in fact, their mean scores declined slightly.

Reading: Spanish as a Dominant Language

Table 3 (page 15) gives the results of the Bond and Singer analyses of Spanish as a dominant language reading for grades 1 - 6, according to the specifications set forth in Section II. As is shown in Table 3, a total of 34 valid and useable pairs of pretest and posttest scores on the IAS Prueba de Lectura were obtained for all grades. Only 1 pair of scores was obtained for the sixth grade.

The results shown for the first graders can be disregarded as questionable for the same reason previously given for those first graders tested in English, i.e., the Bond and Singer Analysis is inappropriate because most pupils had no prior experience in school.

The fifth graders clearly achieved their objective for Spanish reading, scoring an actual posttest mean of 5.1 (SD = .432) with 5 = 4.707 and P = .013 as compared to an expected posttest mean of 3.2 (SD = .666). The second and third graders achieved higher actual posttest scores than expected posttest scores. The second graders approached very closely the statistical criterion for achievement; the third graders fell far short of it. The fourth graders had a lower actual posttest score than expected posttest score; however, this did not represent a statistically significant decline in reading growth rate. The one sixth grader taking the Prueba de Lectura obtained an actual posttest score of 5.5 as compared to an expected posttest score of 3.9, indicating a substantial increase in reading growth rate in Spanish.

The pretest-posttest analyses of Spanish reading achievement given in Table 4 (page 16) show that the first, second and

TABLE 3

SPANISH AS A DOMINANT LANGUAGE: READING ACHIEVEMENT
Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura
Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis
Bond and Singer Method

		Actual Posttest Scores			Expected Posttest Scores				
Grade	Level	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	t(d)	p
First	I	7	2.3	.877	7	1.6	.695	1.470	.201
Second	II	9	3.6	.441	9	2.5	1.198	2.146	.069
Third	II	7	2.0	.424	7	1.9	.743	.202	.847
Fourth	II	5	2.2	.993	5	2.6	1.067	2.216	.113
Fifth	II	5	5.1	.432	5	3.2	.666	4.707	.018
Sixth	II	1	5.5	----	1	3.9	----	-----	----

TABLE 4

SPANISH AS A DOMINANT LANGUAGE: READING ACHIEVEMENT
Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura
Grade Equivalent Total Score Analysis
Pretest-Posttest Method

		Pretest Scores			Posttest Scores				
Grade	Level	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	Number Tested	Mean (G.E.)	Standard Deviation	t(d)	p
First	I	7	1.2	.214	7	2.3	.877	2.998	.030
Second	II	9	2.0	.876	9	3.6	.441	3.788	.007
Third	II	7	1.7	.648	7	2.0	.424	1.109	.318
Fourth	II	5	2.3	.847	5	2.2	.993	.535	.370
Fifth	II	5	2.7	.483	5	5.1	.432	7.341	.005
Sixth	II	1	3.4	----	1	5.5	----	-----	----

fifth grades made a statistically significant improvement in Spanish reading. The third grade achieved a .3 grade equivalent improvement in mean score, but it was not significant. The fourth graders made a .1 grade equivalent decline in mean score during the year. The one sixth grade pupil advanced 2.1 grade equivalents during the year, from a pretest of 3.4 to a posttest of 5.5.

Generally those grades making significant improvements in Spanish reading also demonstrated fairly dramatic increases in the magnitude of mean scores, e.g., the first grade advanced 1.1 grade equivalents, from 1.2 to 2.3; the second grade 1.6 grade equivalents, from 2.0 to 3.6; and the fifth grade 2.4, from 2.7 to 5.1.

Other Areas of Achievement

Data bearing on pupil achievement in other areas, which was derived from the questionnaire survey of bilingual classroom teachers, interviews with Project BUILD staff, evaluator observations and other sources, suggest that Project BUILD pupils may have made their most significant school achievement in non-academic areas, e.g., in school socialization, personality development, social development, etc. According to the bilingual classroom teachers, pupils made considerable improvement during the year in terms of verbalization, social interaction with peers, motivation, class participation and following directions (See Appendix B, Question #15). However, bilingual classroom teachers did not observe improvement in Project BUILD pupils' homework or in their overt or expressed evaluations of themselves and their competence (See Appendix B, #15). The group did note

moderate degrees of improvement in pupils' socialization and behavior management, i.e., how well pupils conformed to the rules and routines of the classroom; they also judged pupils' self-esteem to have improved "moderately well" during the year (#16).

With regard to other academic subjects, the bilingual classroom teachers indicated that Project BUILD pupils achieved their goals for mathematics and English as a second language oral-aural skills "moderately well" (#16). One bilingual classroom teacher emphasized that pupils had improved "to a great extent" in the areas of arts and crafts (#16). As a group the bilingual classroom teachers found that pupils had made only "slight" improvement in the areas of English as a dominant language reading, Spanish as a dominant language reading, and Spanish as a second language oral-aural skills (#16).

Self Concept

In order to assess what was thought to be a primary impact of Project BUILD on participating pupils, a self concept test -- Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test -- was administered at the end of the year to a sample of 14 program participants and a sample of 8 selected as a control group. The control group was made up of pupils who had previously been diagnosed by the Project Build staff as having learning disabilities, but who could not be accomodated by the Project. In selecting the representative samples, an informal attempt was made to bear in mind the following pupil characteristics: language dominance, grade and sex.

Table 5 (page 20) gives the results of the end-of-the-year

administration of the self concept measure in the selected pupils' dominant language (See Appendix E for illustrative items on the measure in English).

On Scale A "What I Think About Myself" Project BUILD pupils and control pupils scored roughly the same. Project BUILD pupils had a mean score of 28.4 (SD = 66.7), and the control group a mean score of 27.1 (SD = 12.78). There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores. It is to be noted that each scale of this instrument was made up of 16 five-choice items, and that the lower score on a scale indicated a more positive self concept. Tentative norms had been developed for this instrument (See Table 5, footnote 2 for description of norming population) and can cautiously be used to interpret these scores. Thus, the sample of Project BUILD pupils scored at the 55%ile and the control sample at the 59%ile.

On Scale B "What My Classroom Teacher Thinks About Me" the BUILD group scored a mean of 28.4 (SD = 11.19) which was at the 60%ile, and the control group scored a mean of 25.3 (SD = 11.23) which was at the 73%ile. There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores.

On Scale C "What My Classmates Think About Me" the BUILD group scored a mean of 27.9 (SD = 8.95) which was at the 64%ile, and the control group scored a mean of 23.8 (SD = 10.11) which was at the 76%ile. Again there was no significant difference in mean scores.

On Total Score the BUILD group obtained a mean score of 84.6 (SD = 24.9) which was at the 56%ile, and the control group scored a mean of 76.1 (SD = 25.3) which was at the 68%ile. There

TABLE 5

SELF CONCEPT: PROGRAM - CONTROL PUPIL COMPARISON
Me, Myself and I:A Self Concept Test
END-OF-THE-YEAR SCORES

	Project BUILD Pupils	%ile Score	Control Pupils	%ile Score
Scale A: What I Think of Myself				
N	14		8	
M	28.4[1]	55[2]	27.1	59
SD	6.77		12.78	
	t = .315 p = .755			
Scale B: What My Classroom Teacher Thinks About Me				
N	14		8	
M	28.4	60	25.3	73
SD	11.19		11.23	
	t = .626 p = .538			
Scale C: What My Classmates Think About Me				
N	14		8	
M	27.9	64	23.8	76
SD	8.95		10.11	
	t = .971 p = .343			
TOTAL SCORE				
N	14		8	
M	84.6	56	76.1	68
SD	24.9		25.3	
	t = .760 p = .556			

[1]The value of scores is reversed; the lower represents the more positive self-concept, the higher less positive.

[2]The norming population for these percentile scores consists of 110 pupils in grades 1-5 at the end of the second year of a bilingual program. This population was made up of children who were Hispanic (58%), Anglo-American (29%) and Afro-American (13%).

was no significant difference in total mean scores.

Generally, all scale scores and total score for both groups appeared high in terms of the norming group, with the control group consistently scoring slightly higher than the Project BUILD pupils; however, the differences between the two groups were never statistically significant. The variability of the scores of Project BUILD pupils appeared to be somewhat less than those of the control group, as indicated by standard deviations.

Based on the findings presented in Table 5, it would appear that the Project BUILD pupils did not achieve their self concept objective as it was formulated in Section II.

Table 6 presents supplementary findings on the performance of Project BUILD and control pupils combined and analyzed in terms of language dominance. Project BUILD English-dominant and Spanish-dominant pupils both scored fairly high on the self concept measure, but the Spanish-dominant pupils scored somewhat higher. The same pattern repeated itself with respect to the control pupils, only in this instance the Spanish-dominant students scored substantially higher. With the groups combined, the English-dominant pupils obtained a mean of 86.3 (SD = 25.7) which was at the 53%ile and the Spanish-dominant pupils obtained a total mean of 78.2 (SD = 24.7) which was at the 65%ile. There was no significant difference between the language dominance groups.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF ENGLISH AND SPANISH DOMINANT PUPILS
Project and Control Pupils Combined
Me, Myself, and I : A Self Concept Test
End-of-Year Total Scores

		English Dominant	%ile	Spanish Dominant	%ile
Project BUILD Pupils	N	3		11	
	M	90.0	50%ile	83.1	57%ile
	SD	34.7		26.6	
Control Pupils	N	6		2	
	M	84.5	56%ile	51.0	97%ile
	SD	23.7		1.4	
Combined Groups	N	9		13	
	M	86.3	53%ile	78.2	65%ile
	SD	25.7		24.7	

t = .752

p = .461

Program Educational Processes

Pupil Selection

The basic premise underlying Project BUILD selection was that bilingual children with learning disabilities would be likely to demonstrate a significant discrepancy between academic skills and general ability. Since most of the children participating in the Project this year were enrolled last year, there was no need to re-administer the battery of selection instruments to them.

New potential participants for the Project were given the Wide Range Achievement Test and the Goodenough-Harris Draw a Man Test to identify pupils with such discrepancies. The NYC Language Assessment Battery (LAB) was utilized as a language dominance measure, and the Slingerland Learning Disability Assessment was also administered to pupils for use as a source of diagnostic information.

At the beginning of the school year, 103 pupils were enrolled in grades 1-6 and receiving the Project's direct services in three schools. Some half dozen pupils were transferred out of the program (a few to special schools) so that by the end of the school year the Project was serving some 97 pupils.

School and district administrators indicated on a questionnaire survey (See Appendix A) that the Project had selected and was serving between 60% and 79% of the bilingual children who needed learning disability remediation in two schools and 0% to 19% in the district as a whole. Administrators rated the selection of pupils for the Project fairly positively, i.e., as somewhat more than "a slight problem." They rated the

question of determining when to terminate a pupil's participation in the Project as a "slight problem." They found there had been no problem in placing and grouping pupils in Project BUILD labs for remediation and instruction (Question #8).

The questionnaire survey of eight regular bilingual classroom teachers (See Appendix B) showed that teachers had an average of between 3 and 4 pupils who had been selected for Project BUILD during 1978-79 (Question #3). Most of the respondents said that they had not participated in the process of selecting pupils for the Project (Question #4). This finding is puzzling since Project BUILD <u>does</u> provide classroom teachers with a form for them to provide systematic input into the selection process. More effective tests and more bilingual classroom teacher input were two of the most frequent suggestions made for improving BUILD selection, as well as exit procedures (#6).

The three Project BUILD Staff members who responded to the evaluator's questionnaire survey (See Appendix C) indicated that they were "only slightly" or "not at all" involved in the selection and grouping of students for the Project (#17). Apparently these Project staff members viewed the process of selection very narrowly (i.e., making the final decision whether or not a child is included) since they did in fact participate in the initial testing and assessment process for selection. All respondents singled out two steps which might improve Project selection and/or grouping procedures: more observation of pupils in the classrooms and more parental input (#16). As regards mainstreaming students from the Project, two of the three staff members were "substantially" involved in making these

determinations (#19). Some suggested ways of improving exit procedures and criteria, viz., more input from bilingual classroom teachers and more observation of students in the bilingual classroom (#21).

Eighty-two percent of the parents responding on their questionnaire survey (See Appendix D) indicated that they were "very pleased" to have their children in the Project; the remainder had no comment. This would seem to suggest that parents generally were quite satisfied with the selection decisions made by the Project regarding their own children.

Direct Services

Direct services, which were the principal ones provided by Project BUILD, consisted of instruction and remediation to bilingual children with learning disabilities. Children enrolled in the Project received these direct instructional and remediation services for approximately one hour Monday through Thursday. For these services children were pulled out of their regular bilingual classes and taken to the Project BUILD Resource Rooms or labs.

Three administrator respondents returned questionnaires (See Appendix A): two principals and one supervisor (Question #1). Although all three were involved at an individual school level (#2), two felt they were only "indirectly" involved with Project BUILD in the schools (#3). All indicated that their schools had been providing a program of bilingual instruction for at least four years (#4). All three respondents indicated that the benefits that pupils derived from participating in BUILD were "helpful," particularly in the improvement of pupils' self concept

and social relationships (#6). Two respondents thought BUILD pupils spent enough time in the Project's remediation labs, while the third administrator thought they definitely did not spend enough time in the BUILD lab, i.e., receiving direct services (#7). One administrator stated that Project BUILD served many children who were potential discipline problems, and that because of the special attention they received in their BUILD classes, they were better able to deal with the regular classroom situation and with school generally (#18).

The eight bilingual classroom teachers surveyed (See Questionnaire, Appendix B) indicated that they had had between three and four Project BUILD pupils in their classes during the school year (#1). Half of the respondents said that the amount of time pupils spent in Project remediation and other instructional activities was "inadequate" (#7) and suggested that more time in Project BUILD classes be provided to these pupils. Most of the classroom teachers reported that they had only a "slight" understanding of Project BUILD's pedagogy or remediation methods (#13). Most of them felt it was important to receive in-service training in bilingual learning disabilities and indicated that they desired training in that area (#14). Almost all of the regular classroom teachers indicated that they would like to see the Project expanded in their school in terms of staff and services (#18).

Two Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and an Educational Associate responded to the questionnaire survey of Project staff (See Appendix C, Question #1). The respondents indicated that some of their main duties besides remediation and

instruction were: curriculum and materials development, staff training, participating in staff meetings, conferring with parents, and testing and evaluation of pupils (#2). All respondents thought that Project BUILD was an advantage to their school system (#25) and wanted to see the Project continued in subsequent years (#26).

Some 35% of the Parents who responded to a questionnaire survey (See Appendix D) indicated they had observed remediation and instruction in Project BUILD's labs (#7). Most of the respondents reported they were pleased with their child's participation in the project (#14). Seventy-one percent of the respondents felt the quality of remediation and instruction in Project BUILD was "excellent" (#16).

Indirect Services

Project BUILD provided a considerable amount of "indirect services" to pupils and teachers outside its immediate scope, i.e., outside of its direct services to the 100 or so pupils enrolled in the three schools. The Project's Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists provided technical and material assistance to bilingual classroom teachers in order that they might increase their effectiveness in instructing Project pupils, as well as other pupils in their regular classrooms. The level of assistance generally appeared to be fairly high, but dependent to some extent on the schools and teachers involved. The Project staff prepared and made available to regular classroom teachers written evaluations of all pupils tested this year and in the previous years. The staff prepared prescriptions of educational treatment for pupils not served directly by the program but who exhibited

symptoms of learning disability and shared these with regular bilingual classroom teachers. The Project staff also held workshops for bilingual classroom teachers in the three schools. The Project's most important and substantial indirect service to teachers in the three schools was provided by its resource centers -- or labs -- which served teachers as a useful and effective resource in the area of learning disability for bilingual children. However, regular classroom teachers appeared not to utilize the resources of the labs as extensively as they might have.

The school and district administrators who were surveyed by means of a questionnaire (See Appendix A) felt that there was more than a "slight" problem of communication between BUILD teachers and bilingual classroom teachers (Question #8). The administrators also indicated that without Project BUILD during the 1978-79 school year there would have been "somewhat less" individualized instruction in the schools, "somewhat less" assistance with testing pupils and measuring their progress and achievement, and less "general peace and harmony" in their classrooms (#18).

Bilingual classroom teachers (See Appendix B) reported that they conferred with Project BUILD teachers about once a month (Question #8). They also noted that substitute teachers were never made available to them so that they could observe activities in the BUILD resource rooms (#9). Most of the bilingual classroom teachers felt that they were only "slightly" advised of the diagnostic assessments and other evaluations of individual pupils (#10). Most of the teachers stated that they visited the

Project resource rooms to examine pupils' records less than once a month, with one teacher indicating that she had no access to those records (#11). The bilingual classroom teachers generally noted that they did not give any special attention to Project BUILD pupils (i.e., with respect to instruction or materials) but treated them like all other pupils (#12).

Staff Development

Staff development activities were found to be quite satisfactory this school year. However, it must still be acknowledged that present institutional, research and materials bases for development of staff for programs serving bilingual children with learning disabilities are limited. With regard to academic training, there continues to be little overlap between the educational specializations of learning disabilities and bilingual education.

The Project staff participated in various in-service workshops conducted by the Project Director, the Project Psychologist and outside consultants. The staff continued to be enrolled in a Learning Disabilities Masters program at a local university. The staff appeared to find their university coursework greatly improved over last year and more related to their duties in the Project.

School and district administrators found the "instructional competence" of both the Learning Disability Specialists and the Educational Associates to be "quite satisfactory" (See Appendix A, Question #8).

The Project staff indicated on their questionnaire survey (See Appendix C) that they had been in their current positions

for at least two years (#3) and in bilingual education for at least three years (#4). All three staff members responding, including the Educational Associate, had B.A. degrees in bilingual education or special education, and in addition, the two teachers had M.A.'s in these fields (#5). The staff indicated that no pre-service training had been conducted this year, but that the in-service training and special workshops had been helpful, particularly the workshop conducted by the Psychologist (#6, #7 and #8). The two respondents who were enrolled in university courses provided under ESEA Title VII found those courses to be "very helpful," particularly the clinic in testing and evaluation (#9). Those subject areas in which the staff felt they needed additional professional preparation were 1) instruction and remediation for bilingual students, 2) bilingual tests and measurements and 3) guidance for bilingual students (#10).

Most parent respondents found the general quality of instruction in the Project (and by inference, the instructional staff) to be "excellent;" the remaining respondents did not have sufficient information for a judgment or had no comment (See Appendix D, Question #16).

Curriculum and Materials

School and District administrators indicated they had a close familiary with Project BUILD curriculum and materials; each one reported having reviewed Project curriculum several times during the year (See Appendix A, Question #10). They also judged both the quantity of materials and their quality or appropriateness to be "no problem" this year (#8).

The Project staff indicated that the curriculum and instructional materials had been adequate/appropriate in

quantity/quality throughout the year (with one staff member indicating there was still a need for more Spanish materials) (See Appendix C, Question #22). All thought they had been provided with adequate information concerning the 1978-79 classes to enable them to order sufficient and appropriate materials (#23).

More than half of the parents indicated that they felt the quantity and quality of the Project's curriculum and instructional materials were "Excellent" (See Appendix D, Question #17).

Parent Involvement

The school and district administrators thought that the project had a "moderately serious problem" with parent and community involvement or support for Project BUILD (See Appendix A, Question #8). Two administrators felt that the parents of students in Project BUILD had "some awareness" of the Project's special goals, rationale and benefits (#12). They commented that the teachers and other staff were very willing to hold meetings and conferences with interested parents.

Project staff members' judgment varied concerning the Project's effectiveness in involving parents in the Project and in the schools (See Appendix C, Question #24). One staff member suggested that alternate means of communication were vital in involving parents. The staff recommended that the Project employ a person willing to work during school or only after school hours to set up a program which would enable parents to contribute more to the implementation of the Project. The staff felt that this additional support was needed because most parents work. The staff reported parent involvement as an important and vital part of this type of project (#24).

Of the 17 parents who responded to the parent questionnaire survey, two-thirds reported having had children who had participated in Project BUILD for at least two years (See Appendix D, Question #1) and had attended at least two parent meetings for Project BUILD during the year (#2). Most of the respondents had received Project communications in either their native language or in a language they understood well (#4) in the form of school bulletins, letters from the Project Director or notes from Project teachers (#3). More than half of the respondents indicated they had not participated in any Project activities during the 1978-79 school year (#5). However, more than half of the respondents had had three or more conferences with BUILD teachers regarding their child's progress during the year (#6). Relatively few parents reported that they had observed instruction in Project classrooms (#7). Most of the parent respondents indicated they were pleased with their child's participation in the Project (#14) and stated that they now felt more comfortable about visiting the school since their child or children had been in Project BUILD (#15). A third of the parents thought that parental involvement in the BUILD Project was "excellent," with the remaining respondents indicating either "average" involvement or insufficient information to make a judgement (#18).

Program Management

In assessing Project BUILD's management and operation during the 1978-79 school year (See Appendix A, Question #8), three school and district administrators indicated two areas where they saw "slight problems": 1) extent of communcation between BJILD teachers and regular classroom teachers and 2) level of assistance and cooperation of the Project Director. On a list of 17 management processes the administrators judged only two to be "ineffective": feedback to subordinates and superiors, and development of staff grievance procedures (#13). All other management processes, including major ones, were rated "effective" or "better than effective," e.g., leadership/management style, program planning, decision making, delegation of authority, selection of staff, supervision and evaluation of personnel, management of instruction, etc. (#13). All three administrators indicated that they frequently communicated, formally or informally, with Project staff regarding the Project (#14) and that they found these communications to be at least "moderatly useful and informative" (#15). One administrator indicated that an established, written policy delineated his/her area of responsibility, while another stated that there was no written policy and that responsibility was determined on an individual case basis (#16). Several suggestions were made by administrators with regard to improving project management (#20). One administrator suggested that in order for the Project to become an asset to the school's bilingual program, it must be an integral part of the program, rather than a supplement to it. Another suggested that teachers in the Bilingual Centers must have more

input and that Project BUILD staff must provide time to share information with Center Teachers. Another suggested that parochial school involvement should be equal to public school involvement in terms of personnel, assistants, etc., since the children are coming from the same target areas. Other recommendations included: more money is needed for enrichment programs, i.e., field trips; more supportive psychological services or a referral system for parents; and more parent meetings and workshops which are held on a regular basis. They also suggested that test results, as well as their implications, be shared with teachers. This year the BUILD staff did not hold classes on Friday. Administrators felt this placed an added burden on Bilingual Center Teachers since they had to include the learning disabled pupils in their instructional program with little help from the BUILD teachers in planning their instructional program. Administrators also questioned the value of the BUILD gym program held every Thursday, since the children attending the BUILD Labs received in fact only 3 days of instruction for remediation of skills in reading and math. The administrators reported that the Center teachers felt little progress, if any, had been shown by the BUILD pupils, and therefore it was crucial that pretest and posttest results be shared with those teachers.

In rating Project operation during the 1978-79 school year, regular classroom teachers (See Appendix B, Question #19) found program management and operation to be without problems in a number of areas, e.g., prompt start-up of Project services, selection, amount and quality of testing, competence of Project staff members, overall Project organization, etc. The classroom

teachers found at least "slight problems" regarding project effectiveness in the areas of "prompt action on referrals to outside agencies" and "project effectiveness in parental involvement." Two-thirds of the classroom teachers thought that Project BUILD was "definitely an advantage to their school." (#20). Under recommendations (#22), several teachers noted that the Project Director had called a meeting in the fall of 1978 to inform regular teachers that regular weekly meetings were to be held between Project Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and regular classroom teachers to inform them of new procedures and forms to facilitate updating of information. The intention of these meetings was to keep a weekly record of skills and progress of learning disabled pupils. The teachers thought this would have been an excellent innovation; however, according to them, it never took place. They indicated they would like to see these meetings held next year. The regular classroom teachers also asked for more information on learning disabilities pedagogy.

In rating various project activities in terms of effectiveness during the 1978-79 school year (#11), the BUILD Project staff found the following to be effective: planning and development, formulation and modifications of goals and objectives, communication with other Project staff, scheduling, training of personnel, supportive services, procurement and management of supplies, materials, etc., office operation and efficiency, etc. They found the following activities or processes to be ineffective: delegation of authority, group problem solving, project grievance and input procedures and the management of instruction. Regarding the management areas which staff members found to be in particular

need of improvement or training (#11) were "delegation of authority" and "program grievance and input procedures."

Most Project BUILD staff members received Project directives and information via telephone conversations, staff meetings, memos and one-to-one conferences (#12). All three staff members responding indicated that they "frequently" conferred about the Project, either formally or informally, with the Project Director and the Project Psychologist (#13). Two staff members felt that the staff meetings had been "moderately useful and informative," while the third found them to be "neither useful nor informative" (#14). One staff member indicated that he/she would like to see most Project needs assessments, modifications and internal evaluations made by the Project teachers, with additional input from the Project Psychologist and Director (#15).

Two-thirds of the 17 parent respondents (See Appendix D, Question #19) assessed the general quality of Project management and supervision to be "excellent" (#19). Under suggestions for improvement, (#20), one parent indicated that the parents could better and more objectively assess the Project if they could be taken to other schools where similar programs exist, thereby having some means of comparison.

SECTION IV: DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

This section discusses and interprets all findings, i.e., those relating to pupil achievement, Project educational processes and Project management, which were given in Section III. In this section the evaluator attempts to synthesize these findings into a coherent whole, which represents the evaluator's best judgment about the implementation and effectiveness of Project BUILD during the 1978-79 school year. Furthermore, whereas in Section III the evaluator presented -- largely at face value -- the data collected, here it is appropriate to critically appraise the nature of the data before attempting to interpret, synthesize and draw conclusions.

Pupil Achievement

Reading

In discussing the findings pertaining to pupil achievement, it is essential to bear in mind a number of factors or considerations which have affected these findings and which complicate their interpretation.

The first consideration is general and would affect all programs whose aim is to assist bilingual children to overcome learning disabilities. There is in fact only a limited body of knowledge available on how programs for the learning disabled -- much less for the learning disabled bilingual child -- should be evaluated. Policies and guidelines for implementing such programs are also only beginning to be delineated. Such policies and guidelines as do exist, one can note, tend to favor the treatment of learning disabled children in their regular classrooms, rather than in special remediation "pull-out" classes.

Yet there does not appear to be solid experimental evidence for one type of programming over the other. There appear not to exist at all any guidelines, either federal, state or local, for the evaluation of programs for the bilingual learning disabled. In the evaluator's opinion, there is a critical need for information on a number of issues, e.g.: What effect on pupils can reasonably be anticipated from a "pull-out" remediation program in which pupils are enrolled for one period a day? What evaluative methodology is appropriate for differentiating between the effects on pupils which are due to regular classroom instruction and those effects which are due to special learning disability remediation in pull-out classes? What academic, social and personality dimensions of the learning disabled bilingual child should be emphasized in a program, and subsequently evaluated? Are reading objectives the most appropriate ones for the initial and middle years of a program and its program evaluation? Are standardized tests appropriate for measuring the academic progress of learning disabled bilingual children, e.g., can the "normal" rates of growth inherent in grade equivalent scores be assumed to be appropriate for such pupils?

These questions and considerations concerning programming for bilingual pupils with learning disabilities and the evaluation methodology currently available for such programs make meaningful and effective evaluation of an individual program difficult.

Also, more specific factors affect the interpretability of the findings resulting from the evaluation of Project BUILD:

Although the number of pupils at each grade level with

both pretest and posttest reading scores was greater than that of last year, the number of scores available at each grade level in the Project still tended to limit the meaningfulness and generalizability of the reading results of this year's evaluation.

The Bond and Singer method of analyzing reading scores, which essentially utilizes each pupil as his/her own control was not fully appropriate for the first grade (it could be considered appropriate only for those first graders retained in grade). Also, the matched control group which was identified and pretested for the first grade could not be posttested because the end-of-year school schedule did not allow adequate time to do so. These factors made it necessary to apply weaker methods of analysis to the first graders' reading performance in English and Spanish, i.e., a simple pretest-posttest comparison for significant improvement in mean scores.

Ideally, the Bond and Singer method of analyzing reading growth should be applied over the entire history of a program and not to one year of a program in isolation, i.e., in order to assess complete program effects, and not merely partial effects. Applying the method to a single year of a program may distort the long-term impact of the program. This would be the case for a pupil who had been in Project BUILD for several years, but whose pretest score from this year was used to calculate an expected reading growth rate. This method could not have been applied retroactively two years because even fewer scores would have been available for analysis. Also, the IAS reading tests were not used the first year to establish baselines for English and Spanish reading.

Consequently, the application of the Bond and Singer method in this instance has several important implications. If Project BUILD pupils who were enrolled in previous years had made substantial progress in reading prior to this year, it would of course erroneously inflate their "expected" posttest scores and make it less likely that they would demonstrate significant improvement in reading growth rates. On the other hand, if pupils did make significant improvements in reading growth rates, their reading achievement could be regarded as clearly and unquestionably demonstrated.

Another factor which appeared to have affected the assessment of reading was encountered in the course of analyzing reading scores. The evaluator found evidence that suggested that pupils in the Project were inadequately classified for purposes of reading instruction in English or Spanish, with respect to language dominance in reading.

Since all Spanish-speaking pupils in grades 1-6 in the District were tested at the end of the year with the IAS Prueba de Lectura, it was possible for the evaluator to obtain the Spanish reading scores for the subgroup of Project BUILD pupils who were classified as English-dominant and given the IAS Test of Reading by the Project staff, but who scored higher in Spanish reading. The end-of-year English and Spanish grade equivalent reading scores for this subgroup are given below:

TABLE 7

SUBGROUP OF "ENGLISH DOMINANT" PUPILS, GRADES 1 - 6

END-OF-YEAR SPANISH AND ENGLISH MEAN SCORES

IAS Prueba de Lectura and Test of Reading

Total Grade Equivalent Scores

		Spanish	English
1st Grade	Number	4	4
	Mean	2.8	2.2
2nd Grade	Number	1	1
	Mean	3.2	2.6
3rd Grade	Number	3	3
	Mean	3.6	2.7
4th Grade	Number	---	---
	Mean	---	---
5th Grade	Number	4	4
	Mean	5.2	3.1
6th Grade	Number	4	4
	Mean	6.4	2.6

Although these 16 students were classified as "English-dominant" and taught reading in English, each grade group appeared to be functioning better in Spanish reading than in English reading at the end of the year. It should of course be kept in mind that the English and Spanish scores are derived from different forms of the test and, more importantly, from different norming groups. Nevertheless, the pattern of scores suggests to the evaluator that this subgroup could read better in Spanish than in English, particularly at the upper grade levels: 5th and 6th grades. It should also be noted that Project BUILD does not necessarily determine a pupil's language dominance independently, since this determination must be made for the regular bilingual classroom setting where factors other than language dominance may come into play in the placement and grouping of pupils. The findings given in Table 7 seem to indicate a weakness in the strategy (whether of regular classroom teachers or of Project BUILD staff) for classifying pupils according to dominance, and providing instruction on that basis. It is a well-established principle in bilingual education that, generally, a child can learn to read best in his dominant or strongest language; in the evaluator's opinion, it would appear that this principle would be even more applicable to the bilingual learning disabled pupil.

Such apparently faulty determinations of language dominance complicate the interpretation of reading results, as can be demonstrated by the performance of the 5th and 6th graders in English-dominant reading. These grades clearly failed to achieve their objectives in English; however, their scores in Spanish reading given in Table 7 strongly suggest that they may have

achieved such reading objectives in Spanish and would have been performing near grade level in Spanish reading at the end of the year.

A final difficulty in interpreting reading results is inherent in the nature of the program and the evaluation design. There was no way of determining what impact a pupil's regular classroom instruction had on reading achievement versus what impact Project BUILD remediation services had on reading instruction. The two influences or causative factors cannot be separated by the present evaluation design.

Bearing in mind the aforementioned factors and considerations which affect the interpretability of reading findings the evaluator summarizes in Table 8 (page 44) and Table 9 (page 46) the overall assessment of pupils' reading achievement during the 1978-79 school year.

TABLE 8

ENGLISH AS A DOMINANT LANGUAGE READING OBJECTIVES

Extent to which Grades Achieved or Approached Criterion of $P \leq .05$

Grade	Numbers of Pupils	Probability Values Resulting from Correlated t Tests: Bond & Singer * Method	Probability Values Resulting from Correlated t Tests: Pretest-Posttest Paradigm	Final Judgmental *** Determination of Attainment of Objectives
1	10	*	.04	Adequately Met
2	8	.04	.01	Strongly Met
3	4	.08	.06	Adequately Met
4	10	.01	.01	Strongly Met
5	6	**	**	Undetermined
6	5	**	**	Undetermined

* Not appropriate for most first graders; furthermore, the designated control group was not posttested for reasons indicated in text.

** Objectives, measurements and analysis not appropriate because pupils were tested in non-dominant language. External evidence suggested that these two grades may have achieved reading objectives in Spanish.

*** It is to be stressed that considerations other than statistical significance and the original formulation of reading objectives entered into these determinations.

In summary, the second and fourth grades clearly met their objectives as stated. The reading achievement of these two grades also probably represents a greater accomplishment than appears from these analyses, for reasons indicated previously in this section, i.e., they achieved their objectives despite the fact that the baseline for assessing their achievement was the beginning of the 1978-79 school, and not the actual beginning of the program. The first and third grades' demonstrated achievement of the English reading objective must be considered "adequate" because only the alternate method of analysis, a pretest-posttest paradigm, could appropriately be applied to the scores of the first graders; and the third graders did not achieve the expected .05 level of significance, although they approached it very closely. Also, in the case of the third graders, the small number of scores analyzed must be borne in mind. The achievement of this objective by the fifth and sixth grades must be viewed as "undetermined" for two reasons": 1) the number of scores available for analysis, and 2) most importantly, pupils apparently were tested in their non-dominant language.

Table 9 summarizes pupils' reading achievement in Spanish as a dominant language:

TABLE 9

SPANISH AS A DOMINANT LANGUAGE READING OBJECTIVES

Extent to which Grades Achieved or Approached Criterion of $P \leq .05$

Grade	Numbers of Pupils	Probability Values Resulting from Correlated t Tests: Bond & Singer * Method	Probability Values Resulting from Correlated t Tests: Pretest-Posttest Paradigm	Final Judgmental *** Determination of Attainment of Objectives
1	7	*	.03	Adequately Met
2	9	.07	.01	Adequately Met
3	7	.85	.32	Not Met
4	5	.11	.37	Not Met
5	5	.02	.01	Strongly Met
6	1	**	**	Adequately Met**

* Not appropriate for first graders; furthermore, designated control group for first graders was not posttested.

** No analysis of results possible because only one subject was tested; however, the one pupil tested in the 6th grade made a 2.1 G.E. gain in score, from 3.4 to 5.5.

*** It is to be stressed that considerations other than statistical significance and the original formulation of reading objectives entered into these determinations.

As shown in Table 9, the fifth grade clearly demonstrated that it achieved its objective for Spanish reading. The one sixth grader tested can also be regarded as having attained this objective, by virtue of a gain in score of great magnitude. The first and second graders also met their objectives, but in a less decisive or clear-cut fashion. The third and fourth graders clearly did not attain their Spanish reading objectives.

The evaluator had no additional external source of information bearing on the language dominance classifications of this group; however, he suspects that the classification of dominance of pupils in this group may be more realistic, since the schools and the Project appear to classify pupils as Spanish-dominant only when the evidence is compelling.

Project BUILD generally achieved greater success in promoting the achievement of English and Spanish reading objectives this year than last year. Last year the evaluators judged that the Project achieved only 2 out of 5 English reading objectives, and both of these were considered "weakly" determined. They judged that four out of six grades achieved their Spanish reading objectives, but in a similarly "weak" manner. In neither language did any group demonstrate a statistically significant increase in reading growth rate as analyzed by the Bond and Singer Method. By contrast, this year four of four grades achieved their English reading objectives, two in a "strong" manner (i.e., by means of the Bond and Singer Method), and two in an "adequate" manner (i.e., by means of the pretest-posttest method). The English reading scores of two grade groups could not be appropriately analyzed because of apparent misclassification of pupils' language

dominance. Also, four out of six Spanish reading objectives could be considered attained; one in a "strong" manner, two in an "adequate" manner, and one objective by virtue of a substantial reading gain made by one student.

Thus, during the 1977-78 school year, Project BUILD achieved six of eleven reading objectives, while during 1978-79, eight of ten objectives were achieved. Moreover, demonstrations of the attainment of reading objectives were much more convincing this year.

Another indication of increasing Program effectiveness in teaching reading was the fact that posttest mean scores in English were on the average .6 G.E.'s higher at each grade level than on the Project's 1978 posttests. In Spanish, the 1979 posttest scores were on the average .7 G.E.'s higher at each grade level than on the Project's 1978 posttests.

Other Areas of Achievement

As was the case with the 1977-78 evaluation study of Project BUILD, the evaluator found considerable evidence suggesting that the Project had an impact on participating pupils in non-academic, school-related skills and behavior, e.g., school socialization, social development, personality development and learning to cope with (or compensate for) learning disabilities. The latter in particular appeared to be a significant implicit aim of Project BUILD instruction.

The evaluator found considerable anecdotal and questionnaire evidence for pupil progress in these areas. Bilingual classroom teachers reported that pupils became more verbal, more interactive with peers, better motivated, more active in

class participation and better at following directions. They indicated that Project BUILD pupils improved with respect to conforming to the rules and routines of the classroom. They also judged that pupils' self-esteem had improved during the year.

The bilingual classroom teachers found that Project BUILD pupils had progressed satisfactorily in math and oral-aural ESL, but less satisfactorily in the academic areas of reading in English and Spanish. The test results obtained by this study on Project BUILD pupils' reading achievement, and given in the previous subsection, do not generally concur with bilingual teachers' judgements of pupil performance in the areas of English and Spanish reading. Evaluator's findings indicate that pupils made more progress in these areas than was perceived by the bilingual classroom teachers.

Self Concept

Project pupils appeared not to have achieved their objective for self concept, as it was formulated in Section II.

However, the evaluator believes one should be cautious in making a judgement about actual pupil improvement in self concept from this finding. This is the case because the bilingual classroom teachers (a group independent of the Project) indicated they observed improvement in this area (actually, "self esteem") when surveyed by questionnaire. A number of other considerations greatly limit the interpretability of the results obtained on the self concept measure.

First, the Project (experimental) and control samples were too small and unrepresentative from which to draw definite

conclusions about Project pupils as a group. Secondly, the samples were not representative in terms of the pupil characteristics listed in Section II. Thirdly, all subjects were only posttested. There was no way of knowing how the two groups might have performed on a pretest.

Fourthly, and most importantly, the differential impacts of regular classroom instruction and Project BUILD remediation were combined. All pupils tested -- both control and Project pupils -- spent most of their school day in regular classroom instruction, and the Project Pupils spent only an additional few hours per week in the Project Learning Disability Labs. There was no way to determine from these data what was the specific impact of Project BUILD on pupils' self concept.

The evaluator believes that these findings probably show mainly the impact of regular classroom instruction. There were no significant differences between control pupils and Project BUILD pupils, although the control group consistently showed a slightly more positive self concept, as measured by the instrument.

Probably the most meaningful outcome of this assessment is revealed by a comparison of the mean scores of both groups with the preliminary percentile norms for the instrument (See Footnote 2, Table 5). These comparisons show that both Project BUILD pupils and control pupils were performing consistently above the 50%ile on the three subscales and total score.

From these percentile norms, one may conclude that the sample of Project BUILD pupils tested at the end of the year appeared to have quite positive conceptions of themselves -- specifically what formed and/or influenced these conceptions is not known.

Program Educational Processes

Selection

Project BUILD selection procedures were found to be principled and systematic; and considering the difficulties inherent in identifying bilingual children with learning disabilities, these selection procedures must be considered adequately reliable, valid and economical in application. However, the evaluator encountered some evidence that was contrary to this general assessment. Both Project BUILD Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and regular classroom teachers indicated a desire to, or a lack of opportunity to, have input into the selection process. It appeared that both groups did have adequate opportunity for input into the selection process, but wanted a greater role in the final decision-making regarding individual children. It seemed that the Project has not fully elaborated a decision-making model which systematically incorporates test data as well as observational and judgmental or "clinical" information.

As was noted last year, there is evidence that some -- perhaps a number of -- pupils in the project were not genuinely learning disabled, but appeared to be so because of emotional, social and prior educational factors. The Project's "discrepency" model for selecting pupils appears practical and useable, but its outcomes or selection decisions are sometimes too general or too gross, i.e., neither specific nor fine. Perhaps it could be effectively supplemented by more systematic inclusion of teacher observations, judgemental inputs and by careful, clinical-type findings on individual children. The selection procedure could also perhaps be strengthened by a better selection of achievement and general or learning measures.

The Project staff should perhaps also undertake a review of the various definitions of learning disability with a view toward borrowing specific features which can be incorporated in its current definition, thereby rendering its selection procedure outcomes more valid and effective. These would include definitions of learning disability which emphasize "neurological dysfunction" (Johnson and Myklebust, 1967); "uneven growth pattern" (Gallagher, 1966); "difficulty in academic and learning tasks" (Kirk, 1962); "definition by exclusion" (Johnson and Myklebust, 1967); definition of the U.S. Office of Education (Kass and Myklebust, 1969); definition of the National Committee on Handicapped Children; and the definition prepared by BOCES.

In its review of definitions of learning disabilities and relevant literature the Project BUILD staff should give particular attention to the definition of learning disability given by the new Federal law on the education of the handicapped, PL 94-142, since it is likely to become the definitive one.

Direct Services

The evaluator found that the Project continued to provide direct services to pupils during the 1978-79 school year effectively, and also in compliance with its Application and Continuation Proposals. The principal exception to this was that the Project served approximately 100 pupils and not the 125 anticipated in the original Application. (However, in the evaluator's opinion, the latter number could not have been effectively served, given the decrease in staff size this year.)

Educational and remediation treatments were written for all pupils in the Project. Children in the Project received

direct remediation one hour per day, four days a week. One period or part of a period was generally devoted to physical exercises which were designed to have therapeutic effects on learning disabled children, and which generally appear to do so. The evaluator considered this a valuable part of the overall learning disability treatment program of Project BUILD.

Pupils enrolled in the Project who needed additional testing and diagnostic evaluation, received it from the Psychological Consultant, who continued to perform these services effectively, professionally and conscientiously. The Project staff maintained profile sheets and a number of other records for each pupil, which indicated their progress in reading, math and other areas.

The Project experienced no major operational or implementation problems this year. Project services began near the beginning of the school year, and referral of pupils to outside agencies began fairly promptly thereafter. Also, the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists appeared to receive more adequate on-site supervision and feedback from the Project Director and the Psychological Consultant than was the case last year.

The strongest aspect of the entire Project appeared to be the instructional, remediational and therapeutic services provided by the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and Educational Associates in the Learning Disability Labs in the three schools. These staff members appeared to be well-trained, energetic, perceptive, sensitive to learning disabled children and very effective in promoting learning in children. They provided bilingual learning disabled children with the stimulating

and supportive environment which they need to overcome learning disabilities and related problems.

Indirect Services

Project BUILD staff provided a considerable amount of indirect services to pupils and teachers outside of the Project's immediate scope. These services consisted largely of technical and material assistance to regular bilingual teachers so that they might increase their effectiveness in their own classrooms. The level of assistance appeared fairly high -- especially considering the extent of the staff's involvement in direct services -- but varied somewhat across teachers and schools. Some regular classroom teachers expressed the desire to have more assistance from the Project BUILD staff.

In general, however, the proportion of effort devoted to indirect services is rather small when compared with the staff's efforts in the area of direct services, and when the potential significance of these indirect services is considered. In the evaluator's opinion, much greater effort could be directed by the Project BUILD staff at assisting regular classroom teachers and generally transmitting to them the knowledge, skills, techniques, understanding, and assessment materials and know-how of the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists. In other words, ideally, the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists should become teacher trainers. This is more in keeping with the spirit of PL 94-142. Also, efforts which are devoted to training regular classroom techers will eventually have a greater impact on the large number of children in the District who are in need of learning disability remediation.

Staff Development

The staff of Project BUILD functioned this year at a high level of technical and pedagogical competence. The staff appeared receptive to training, and apparently benefited a great deal from coursework in learning disabilities at a local university. The instructional staff also benefited from in-service training and workshops provided by the Psychological Consultant and the Project Director.

Curriculum and Materials

The Project staff, as well as other school personnel having some relationship to the Project, found the quantity and quality of Project curriculum and materials to be quite satisfactory. There did appear to be a few problems in ordering and procuring new materials this year.

Parental Involvement

The Project appeared to be only partially successful in involving parents in the Project and its educational and other activities. The nature of Project BUILD and its goals and objectives relating to bilingual learning disabled pupils require a much greater extent of parental involvement than most ESEA Title VII Projects. This is the case because parents can, or should, have a strong supportive role in helping Project staff help bilingual learning disabled children overcome their learning disabilities.

The Project did not disseminate sufficient materials on bilingual learning disabilities to parents to inform them and give them some basis for helping their children at home. As noted in the case of regular classroom teachers, a major effort

should be made by the Project staff in training parents to help their own children overcome learning disabilities. Such an effort would appear to be called for, considering the general trends and policies of current learning disability remediation.

Program Management

Project BUILD's management and administration were effective this year; program management structure and processes generally tended to promote the achievement of Project objectives.

The evaluator found no evidence of any major management problems within Project BUILD during the 1978-79 school year. The management structure and processes of the Project did not appear to hinder in any serious way the accomplishment of instructional or remediational goals and objectives. The success of the Project in these regards must be credited to the Project Director, who appears to have grown in her role as an administrator and manager.

The areas in which the Project needs to improve management effectiveness are: 1) more extensive contact and communication between Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and regular classroom teachers, 2) more effective staff meetings -- in terms of regularity, structure, content and group problem solving capability, and 3) more careful and systematic building of relationships with parents, which would make possible the effective transmission of information and skills with which parents can help their bilingual children with learning disabilities.

Overall Project Implementation and Effectiveness

In the evaluator's opinion, Project BUILD was generally implemented effectively during the 1978-79 school year. This was the case from various points of view, e.g., in terms of Project start-up and adherence to its time line of activities, in terms of the professional performance of the staff, in terms of program management and in terms of its adherence to its Application and Continuation Proposals. The principal areas of weakness in Project implementation concerned relationships and communication between Project staff, on the one hand, and school and District administrators on the other; a need for more extensive (teacher-teacher trainer type) relationships between Project BUILD staff and regular classroom teachers; more developed relationships with parents which would facilitate the flow of practical information and learning disability remediation know-how to parents; and more effective staff meetings.

With respect to effectiveness, there is no question that Project BUILD was more effective during 1978-79 than in the previous year. Project BUILD pupils demonstrated greater achievement in English and Spanish reading. They appeared to perform well in certain other areas also: they showed improvement in social development and adjustment in their regular classrooms and in school as a whole. Also, by the end of the year they appeared to possess fairly high self concepts, although they did not perform significantly higher than a small comparison group on a test of self concept.

The Project's major educational processes -- pupil selection, direct services, indirect services, staff development,

curriculum and materials, and parent involvement -- generally appeared adequately effective in promoting pupils' development, learning and ability to cope with learning disabilities. While certain weaknesses were noted in the processes of pupil selection and parent involvement, the other major educational processes were found to be very effective.

Project management was found to be effective in supporting and promoting Project goals and objectives, particularly objectives relating to pupil achievement and development.

In conclusion, the Project during 1978-79 must be considered quite effective overall -- certainly more effective than during the previous year. However, some fundamental problems inherent in this Project remain. First, and most importantly, a pull-out learning disabilities program for bilingual children has definite limitations on its capacity to have an impact on children, both in terms of individual children directly served, and in terms of the larger numbers of children indirectly served through their regular classroom teachers. This would mainly appear to be due to amount, intensity and quality of exposure time to learning disability instruction and remediation. Secondly, the Project's definition of bilingual learning disabilities is somewhat inadequate (although practical and economical) and the selection procedures which follow from it lack precision. Thirdly, the Project has not been as effective as it could have been in having an impact on participating pupils' parents, thereby enabling them to acquire skills to remediate their own learning disabled children; after all, three Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and two Educational Associates can have an impact

on only a limited number of children. Fourthly, the Project has not been able in the cases of some pupils to provide remediation in the right pupil language, i.e., in the language that would be justified on pedagogical grounds. This appeared to be due to school and regular classroom policies, over which the Project has no control, and also to faulty determinations of language dominance. Finally, the long-term future of Project BUILD remains questionable in light of PL 24-142, which emphasizes maintaining learning disabled children in the classroom and providing special learning disability remediation training to regular classroom teachers.

SECTION V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the problems and limitations of this Project as an educational program, problems which are both inherent in its nature and in the setting in which it is implemented, and considering all evaluation findings for the 1978-79 school year, Project BUILD must generally be considered a very successful educational effort.

Project BUILD adequately met most of its instructional (remediational) or pupil objectives, i.e., for English reading, Spanish reading, certain other academic areas, pupils' social and personal development or adjustment in school, and pupil self concept. Some of these findings, however, were not grounded solidly in empirical data, but were arrived at by a fairly "creative" interpretation of findings and use of relevant information from a variety of sources.

The evaluator found the assessment of pupil achievement was complicated by several fundamental problems concerning the nature of Project BUILD, appropriateness of the evaluation design and evaluation objectives, data analysis and interpretation. The evaluation raised fundamental questions about the assessment of achievement of bilingual children with learning disabilities, which could not be resolved within the scope of an evaluation study.

The Project's educational processes of selection, direct services, indirect services, staff development, curriculum and materials and parent involvement were generally found to be effectively implemented. However, shortcomings were noted in the procedures for the selection of children for the Project and in parental involvement.

Project management was judged to be effective. The Project Director and other Project staff appeared to be developing very good capabilities in the area of program management and administration.

Although many factors tended to impede effective implementation, the Project by the end of the year was judged to be effectively implemented in terms of its original plans and specifications.

Despite the problems and limitations inherent in the Project and its setting, the evaluator strongly recommends its continuation. Continuation is justified by the innovative and experimental nature of this educational program alone. It is also justified by the findings of this evaluation. However, in the final two years of the program, local School District and Project staff must adequately address some of the programmatic and policy questions about Project BUILD which have been raised in this evaluation study.

With a view toward addressing some of those problems and strengthening the Project, the evaluator offers the following recommendations:

Recommendations

Selection

1. Re-examine principles for selection, including Project's definition of learning disabilities.

2. Provide for more effective assessment of language dominance

3. Re-assess all diagnostic and selection instruments used.

4. Specify how all non-psychometric data, i.e., information other than test data, are to be utilized in the selection process.

5. Summarize how and why each child was selected for the Project and share this information with participating pupils' regular classroom teachers.

6. Consider using in the selection battery other tests of general ability and achievement, e.g., the English and Spanish versions of the IAS General Ability Test, Levels Preschool, I, II and II, the Raven Progressive Matrices, the Marymount Picture Vocabulary Test, English and Spanish Versions, etc., the Standford Early School Achievement Test, English and Spanish (Puerto Rican) versions, etc.

7. Discontinue the use of the Goodenough-Harris Test as a general ability test in the initial selection process and substitute the IAS General Ability Test/Prueba de Habilidad General or the Raven Progressive Matrices. When used with tests of school achievement, one of these tests would clearly provide a much more effective procedure for ascertaining discrepancies between general ability and achievement.

Direct Services: Instruction, Remediation, Treatment

1. Provide for more effective determination of instructional/ treatment language.

2. Vary instructional time depending on pupil needs.

3. Increase the amount of instructional time where necessary (instructional time is probably not adequate in most cases).

4. Establish language use policy for instruction in Learning Disability Labs.

5. Medical and health services implemented this year should be continued; however, consideration should be given to establishing a relationship with hospital closer to the Project site.

Indirect Services

1. Provide for more, and more effective, contact and exchange of information between the Project Director and Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists, on the one hand, and regular classroom teachers, on the other, concerning individual pupils, learning disability techniques and materials, etc.

2. Project staff should place much greater priority on the training of bilingual classroom teachers in the use of appropriate instructional techniques and materials for bilingual children with learning disabilities. (Much of this training can be carried out unobtrusively by the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists).

3. Project staff should share selection, diagnostic evaluation and achievement test results and other results of assessment which may be pedagogically useful to regular bilingual classroom teachers whose pupils are in Project BUILD. (Some test results, e.g., intelligence tests used by the Psychological Consultant, cannot be fully shared; however, interpretations of such tests can probably be shared with the regular bilingual classroom teachers).

4. Have the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists do more informal observation and individual or small group remediation in the regular classes, in order to provide instructional services to children, as well as informal, indirect training to the regular classroom teachers.

Curriculum and Materials

1. Review currently available assessment materials for bilingual education, including English and Spanish proficiency tests, English and Spanish dominance test, reading tests in English and Spanish, subject matter tests, psychological tests, etc. (Two recent publications survey tests available for bilingual education very comprehensively).

2. Steps should be taken at the District and Central Board of Education levels to expedite the allocation of funds for curriculum and assessment materials so that instruction and testing can be implemented on schedule.

Staff Development and Training

1. Give the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists a greater role as teacher trainers to the regular bilingual classroom teachers.

2. Use more training consultants in in-service staff training at Friday staff meetings, who are competent in both the fields of bilingual education and special education or

related fields, e.g., human development, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, cognitive psychology, etc. Also, steps should be taken at the District and Central Board of Education levels to expedite approval and payment of consultants and outside specialists so that the Project can utilize their services in a more timely and effective manner.

Parent Involvement

1. Train parents of pupils participating in Project BUILD to continue and reinforce the instruction and remediation carried out in the Learning Disability Labs.

2. Initiate a community public relations effort to disseminate information about the Project to parents, the community at large and the local School District.

3. Plan, develop and implement a more effective program for involving parents of children in the Project, in order to give parents a better understanding of learning disabilities, and also to actively involve them in the treatment processes applicable to their own children.

Program Management

1. Institute regular staff meetings on Friday, the day of the week when the staff does not hold learning disability classes with pupils.

2. Devote one meeting on the same Friday every month to administrative matters and group problem-solving.

3. Devote one Friday meeting a month to meetings and conferences between the Bilingual Learning Disability Specialists and the regular classroom teachers during the latter's prep period, for the purpose of assisting the regular classroom teachers with the instruction of bilingual learning disabled children in their own classrooms.

4. Plan on a regular basis two other Friday meetings a month, which can be called by the Project Director, and which will be concerned with field visits, in-service training, mini-workshops, conferences and presentations.

5. As a group task, prepare written job descriptions for each staff member so that each staff member has a precise knowledge of what his/her job responsibilities consist of, and disseminate such job descriptions to all administrators and supervisors involved in the Project.

6. Together with school and district administrators, review the problems and limitations inherent in Project BUILD as an educational program or model; (These were discussed throughout this report) and also in the Project setting, and determine what modifications should be made in Project

BUILD so that it may best serve the needs of bilingual children with learning disabilities in the District and also be in more accord with current policies, models and practices for educating the learning disabled.

General

1. Seek additional funding for Project BUILD in order that it may be developed as a model program for educating bilingual children with learning disabilities, and also so that it might undertake some of the long-range goals suggested by the evaluators in this and previous reports.

A P P E N D I C E S

A. Questionnaire for School and District Administrators

B. Questionnaire for Regular Classroom Teachers

C. Questionnaire for Bilingual Program Staff

D. Parent Questionnaire

E. Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test (Sample items from English Answer Booklet)

F. Procedures Employed in Bond and Singer Method

APPENDIX A

EDWARD J. CERVENKA, PH.D.
CONSULTANT IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS
617 WEST END AVENUE
SUITE 9-A
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024
(212) 724-0160

June 15, 1979

Dear Administrator:

This questionnaire is part of the 1978-79 evaluation of your ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program. As a member of the District's and/or school's administrative staff, you can provide an important and different perspective on the Program, than that provided by the Program staff. Your responses to this questionnaire are needed so that your viewpoints can be incorporated in the evaluation.

Please answer all of the questions frankly. You are asked not to put your name on your questionnaire. Generally, your responses can be given by marking a check (✓) or a number in the appropriate blanks. Some questions will have more than one answer or require you to mark in several places. For those areas in which you might have insufficient information to make a judgment, an appropriate category of response has been provided. At the end of the questionnaire you are asked to make recommendations for improving the Program. Also, additional space is given for any other comments.

A self-addressed envelope is provided in which to seal your completed questionnaire and return it either via the Bilingual Program Director or directly to the evaluators.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Cervenka

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Title VII Program Evaluator

Questionnaire for School and District Administrators

Code : f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; m = mean rating
3 = total number of questionnaire respondents

1. What is your position in the school system?

f	%	School Positions	f	%	District Positions
2	67	Principal	0	0	District Administrator
0	0	Assistant Principal	0	0	Other_____
0	0	Coordinator			
1	33	Supervisor			
0	0	Other_____			

2. At what level of school administration are you involved?

3	100	An individual school
0	0	Two or more schools
0	0	District level only

3. Would you characterize yourself as being directly or indirectly involved with the Title VII Bilingual Program in the schools?

1	33	Directly involved
2	67	Indirectly involved
0	0	Involvement difficult to characterize in the above terms

4. For how many years, including this one, has your school and/or District been providing a program of bilingual instruction?

0	0	One year	1	33	Five years
0	0	Two years	1	33	Six years or more
0	0	Three years			
1	33	Four years			

5. To the best of your knowledge, what percentage of pupils needing bilingual learning disability remediation in your school(s) or District are being served by the Title VII Bilingual Program (Project BUILD) and by other school or District programs?

Title VII Bilingual Program			Other School or District Programs	
			f	%
0	0	90-100%	0	0
0	0	80-89%	0	0
1	33	70-79%	0	0
1	33	60-69%	1	33
0	0	50-59%	0	0
0	0	40-49%	0	0
0	0	30-39%	0	0
0	0	20-29	0	0
1	33	0-19	0	0
0	0	Do Not Know	2	67

... characterize the benefits that students derived from participating in Project BUILD?

f	%		f	%	
1	33	Essential	0	0	Minor
1	33	Important	0	0	Inconsequential
1	33	Helpful	0	0	Do not know

Comments: _____

_____

_____

7. Do you feel the students spend enough time receiving bilingual learning disability remediation in Project BUILD?

1	33	Yes, definitely	1	33	No, definitely not
1	33	Yes, probably	0	0	Do not know or not applicable
0	0	No, probably not			

8. Below is a list of possible problem areas you may have encountered in the operation of Project BUILD in your school(s) or District. Indicate how serious each has been by using the following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = No problem	A = 1
B = Slight problem	B = 2
C = Moderately serious problem	C = 3
D = Very serious problem	D = 4
NA = Not applicable	

f	m	
3	2.3	Selection of pupils for participation in Project BUILD
3	2	Determining when to terminate pupil participation in Project BUILD
3	1.3	Placement and grouping of pupils in Project BUILD Labs for remediation and instruction
3	1	Adequacy of space for remediation and instruction
3	1.3	Testing of participating pupils
3	1.3	Scheduling of remediation and instruction (including length of periods)
3	2.3	Communication between Project BUILD teachers and bilingual classroom teachers
3	1.7	Cooperation between Project BUILD teachers and bilingual classroom teachers
3	1.7	Pupil attendance
3	2	Integration of Project BUILD pupils and other pupils for instruction in academic subjects
3	1.7	Attendance of Bilingual Learning Disability Teachers
2	1	Attendance of paraprofessionals, aides and other auxillary instructional staff
3	1	Instructional competence of Bilingual Learning Disability Teachers
2	1	Instructional competence of paraprofessionals, aides and other auxillary instructional staff
3	1.3	Quantity of materials and other instructional aids
3	1	Quality or appropriateness of materials or other instructional aids available
3	3	Parent and community involvement and support of Project BUILD
3	1.3	Assistance and cooperation of Bilingual Learning Disability Teachers
3	2	Assistance and cooperation of Project Director

9. [illegible] regular meetings and/or workshops between regular classroom teachers and Project BUILD teachers for the purpose of exchanging information, feedback, instruction/remediational materials and techniques, etc.?

f	%	
0	0	Yes, regular and frequent meetings are provided for
1	33	Yes, but more contact between these two groups is needed
0	0	No, only occasional meetings are provided for
1	33	No, no meetings are provided for
1	33	Not applicable to my school or situation

10. During the past year, how frequently have you performed or been involved with the following activities relating to the Bilingual Program? Use following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = Nine or more times	A = 1
B = Six to eight times	B = 2
C = Three to five times	C = 3
D = Once or twice	D = 4
E = Never	E = 5
F = Not applicable	

f	m	
3	3	Participated in the implementation in the school(s) of Bilingual Program policy, regulations and/or program modifications
3	4.3	Participated in the evaluation and needs assessment of the Program vis-a-vis established Program guidelines (i.e., those established by the Program proposal, Project BUILD Director, District Office, etc.)
3	4.3	Participated in the evaluation and needs assessment of the Program vis-a-vis actual classrooms and parent-community realities
3	4.7	Participated in the development or review of Program Proposal for Continuation or Grant Application
3	3.6	Conferred and/or met with parents of students in the Bilingual Program
3	4	Called upon the Project Director to deal with problems relating to Project instruction and remediation
3	3	Called upon the Learning Disability Teachers to deal with problems relating to Project instruction and remediation
3	3	Reviewed the curriculum of Project BUILD used in the school(s)
3	2.3	Reviewed the management of Project BUILD in the schools(s)
3	4	Conferred with Project Psychologist about the Program
3	4.7	Participated in the development of selection criteria and process for admission of new students in the Program
3	4.3	Reviewed Program student enrollment and achievement for the purpose of transferring students <u>out</u> of the Program and into the "mainstream"
3	3.6	Observed Program teachers and/or paraprofessionals giving instruction
3	3.6	Conferred with the Project Director concerning the Program
1	5	Conferred with PAC representative(s) in regard to matters pertaining to the Program

11. To what extent has Project BUILD increased parental involvement in school affairs this school year?

f	%		f	%	
0	0	Substantially	1	33	Not at all
1	33	Moderately	1	33	Do not know
0	0	Slightly			

12. To what extent are parents of students in PROJECT BUILD aware of the special goals, rationale and benefits of the Program?

f	%	
0	0	Clearly aware
2	67	Have some awareness
0	0	Are unaware of any distinction between this specific program and regular school curriculum and activities
1	33	Do not know

Comments: _____

_____

_____

13. Indicate how effective you believe Program management has been with respect to the management functions listed below. Use the following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = Very effective	A = 1
B = Effective	B = 2
C = Not effective	C = 3
D = Detremental	D = 4
X = Do not know/not applicable	

f	m		f	m	
2	2	Leadership/management style	3	2.3	Internal evaluation and monitoring
3	2	Program planning	3	1.7	Procurement of materials and supplies
2	2	Decision making/policy formulation	2	2	Operation and efficiency of Program office
2	2	Delegation of authority	3	2	Dissemination of information about Program
3	1.3	Selection of staff	3	2.3	Formulation and modification of Program goals and objectives
3	2.3	Supervision and evaluation of personnel	1	3	Development of grievance procedure
3	3	Feedback to subordinates and superiors	3	1.3	Management of instruction (i.e., all those factors affecting instruction except teaching)
3	2.3	Communication	3	2	Space and time utilization and management
3	2.3	Organization and coordination of activities			

Comments: _____

_____

_____

14. How often did you communicate or confer, either formally or informally, with the Project staff about the Program?

f	%		f	%	
0	0	Very frequently	0	0	Very infrequently
3	100	Frequently	0	0	Never
0	0	Infrequently			

15. Generally how useful and informative were these communications or conferences?

1	33	Very useful and informative	0	0	Neither useful nor informative
2	67	Moderately useful and informative	0	0	Not applicable/no conferences or communications
0	0	Slightly useful and informative			

16. As you may be aware, the teachers and paraprofessionals in the Project BUILD are responsible and obligated to two separate, and possibly conflicting, lines of authority; these are (A) individual school/District staffs and (B) the Bilingual Program staff. Acknowledging this possible blurring of supervisory lines, have you developed a policy for the areas of Bilingual Program activity for which you have supervisory or administrative responsibility, and for other areas which fall under the domain of the Project BUILD Director and the Bilingual Learning Disability Teachers? (You may choose several answers.)

f	%	
1	33	There is established written policy which delineates my areas of responsibility
0	0	No written policy, but I have a clear understanding of my areas of responsibility
1	33	No written policy; I determine my responsibility on an individual case basis
0	0	I expect teachers and/or Bilingual Program staff to come to me first, and then I can make a determination of responsibility
0	0	I leave determination of responsibility to the discretion of the teachers and/or school administration
0	0	The Program staff and I have met and jointly determined our separate areas of responsibility.
0	0	The Program teachers and I have met and jointly determined my areas of responsibility
1	33	No determination -- this issue has never required my attention
1	33	No opinion/not applicable

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

17. Which statement best sums up your opinion of the Program?

1	33	It is a vital addition to our school system.
1	33	It is definitely an advantage to our school system.
1	33	It could be an advantage if it were improved in certain ways.
0	0	It is rather ineffectual in terms of our initial expectations.
0	0	It is more of a hinderance than an asset.

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

18. If this year (1978-79) there had been no Bilingual Program funded under Title VII, what probably would have been the case in terms of the items listed below? (Use the following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = Much greater	A = 1
B = Somewhat greater	B = 2
C = Same/not affected	C = 3
D = Somewhat less	D = 4
E = Much less	E = 5

f	m	
3	2	Amount of work for you
3	4.3	Students' academic achievement

(Continued on following page)

(Item No. 18 cont.)

f	m	
3	4.3	Students' psychological and social development (confidence, self esteem, motivation, peer relationships, school adjustment, etc.)
3	3.3	Students' knowledge of and pride in cultural heritage
3	3.7	Student attendance
3	4.7	Provision of individualized instruction
3	4.3	Training of school staff in area of bilingual learning disability remediation
3	4.7	Assistance with testing students/measuring their progress and achievement
3	4	Assistance with curriculum
3	4.3	Instructional materials, aids and supplies
3	4	Assistance with parent-school matters
3	3.7	Parent involvement in school activities
1	5	Other (Please specify:_____

Comments:_____

19. In your opinion, should ESEA Title VII Federal funding for Project BUILD be sought for next year and subsequent years?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
3	100	Yes	0	0	No	0	0	No opinion

Also, please comment on how you think Project BUILD can best be institutionalized in the school(s) or District after Title VII funding expires.

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. Please list below any suggestions you may have to offer for improving the Program next year and in subsequent years. (Use back of page if necessary.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

EDWARD J. CERVENKA, PH.D.
CONSULTANT IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS
617 WEST END AVENUE
SUITE 9-A
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024

June 5, 1979

Dear Classroom Teacher:

Your responses to this questionnaire are needed for the Federally required evaluation study of Project BUILD. Full consideration will be given to your answers in making recommendations for modifications and improvements in this program next year. Please answer all questions and then place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and then seal it and give it to the Bilingual Learning Disability Teacher in your school, who will then transmit it to the evaluators.

PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE.

The evaluators will be the only persons analyzing the results of this questionnaire survey, and they will delete any information which identifies individual bilingual classroom teachers.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Cervenka

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Evaluator of Project BUILD

PROJECT BUILD

Questionnaire for Regular Classroom Teachers

Code: f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; m = mean rating
8 = total number of questionnaire respondents

1. How many pupils in your class participated in Project BUILD during the 1978-79 school year?

f m
8 3.6 _____ (Number of pupils)

2. How many of the above pupils also participated in the Project during the 1977-78 school year?

8 1.8 _____ (Number of pupils)

3. To what extent did you participate in the selection of pupils for the Project? (Check one)

f	%		f	%	
6	75	Not at all	0	0	To a considerable extent
0	0	To a slight extent	0	0	To a great extent
1	13	To some extent	0	0	Totally responsible
			1	13	No comment

4. To what extent were you satisfied with the procedures for selecting pupils for the Project? (Check your appropriate grade level.)

f	%		Grade 1	Grades 2 - 6
0	0	Very unsatisfied		
2	25	A little unsatisfied		
4	50	Satisfied		
0	0	Quite satisfied		
0	0	Very satisfied		
2	25	No comment		

5. To what extent were you satisfied with the post-Project placement of those pupils, who for reasons other than complete remediation, i.e., too old for class, family change of residence, etc., had to exit the Project even though they still required special help? (Check your appropriate grade level.)

		Grade 1	Grades 2 - 6
5	63 No comment		
0	0 Very unsatisfied		
0	0 A little unsatisfied		
3	38 Satisfied		
0	0 Quite satisfied		
0	0 Very satisfied		

6. In your opinion, how might the selection and exit procedures be improved? (Check as many as applicable.)

3	38	Don't know	1	13 No comment
0	0	All right as they are	1	13 More observation of pupils in classroom
2	25	More effective tests	1	13 Parental input
4	50	More bilingual classroom teacher input	0	0 Other (Specify): _____

7. How do you feel about the amount of time pupils spend in Project remediation and instructional activities?

2	25	It is adequate	0	0 It is excessive; less time is needed
4	50	It is inadequate; more time is needed	2	25 No basis for judgment

8. How frequently did you meet to confer with the Bilingual Learning Disability teacher about your pupils?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
1	13	Two or more times a week	0	0	Once every two weeks	3	38	Less than once a month
0	0	Once a week	2	28	Once a month	2	25	Never

9. Are classroom substitute teachers made available to you so that you may leave your classes to observe your BUILD students in their Project classroom?

f	%		f	%	
8	100	Never	0	0	Frequently
0	0	Infrequently	0	0	On a regular basis/whenever requested

10. How well are you kept informed by the Bilingual Learning Disability teacher about the diagnostic assessment and evaluation of individual pupils?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
2	25	Not at all	4	50	To a slight extent	1	13	To a considerable extent
1	13	To a great extent						

11. How frequently do you visit the Project resource room in your school to examine diagnostic and instructional records of your pupils?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
0	0	Two or more times a week	0	0	Once every two weeks	6	75	Less than once a month
0	0	Once a week	1	13	Once a month	1	13	No comment

12. Do you give special attention or treatment in your classroom to the Project pupils or do you treat them as any pupils in your class in terms of educational method, materials, individualization, etc.?

f	%		f	%	
3	38	Yes, I give them special educational treatment	5	63	No, I treat them as I do any other pupils in my class

13. Do you feel that you have a clear understanding of the pedagogy of Project BUILD?

0	0	No understanding	1	13	Considerable understanding
6	75	Slight understanding	1	13	Clear understanding

14. Should regular classroom teachers receive in-service training in bilingual learning disabilities in order to use those methods and approaches in their own classrooms in teaching Project BUILD pupils? (Check one item in each column.)

0	0	Not important	0	0	No training wanted
0	0	Slightly important	0	0	Little training wanted
4	50	Important	4	50	Moderate amount of training wanted
3	38	Very important	1	13	Extensive training wanted
1	13	No comment	3	38	No comment

15. What specific benefits have your pupils received from the Project? (Check as many as applicable.)

3	38	They are more verbal	3	38	They respond better to questions
4	50	They participate more in class	4	50	They demonstrate more confidence
3	38	They are more motivated to learn	1	13	They express higher evaluations of self and competence
4	50	They interact more with peers			
3	38	They follow directions better	1	13	Other (Specify): ~~have not observed any outstanding change~~
1	13	Their homework is improved			

16. In your opinion, how well has the Project accomplished the following? (Use this code for each item: 5 = Great extent; 4 = Moderately; 3 = Slightly; 2 = Not at all; 1 = Don't know X = Not applicable

f	m	
3	3.3	English as a dominant language reading improvement
3	2.7	Spanish as a dominant language reading improvement
4	3.8	Math improvement
4	3.8	English as a second language oral-aural improvement

(Question 16 is continued on following page)

(Question 16 continued)

f	m	
3	3.3	Spanish as a second language oral-aural improvement
5	3.6	Improvement in socialization and behavior management (conforms to rules and routines of the classroom)
5	3.8	Improvement in self-esteem
1	5	Other (Optional): Arts and crafts such as weaving, fingerpainting to music, etc. This has been ego boosting to the children and they enjoy going to the Project.

17. In your judgment, how much progress have the Project pupils made this year in comparison with similar pupils who did not receive such services this year or in previous years?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
1	13	Substantially more	2	25	Slightly more	0	0	Somewhat less
1	13	Quite a bit more	1	13	Much the same	0	0	Much less
1	13	No comment				2	25	Don't know

18. Would you like the Project in your school to be...

f	%		f	%		f	%	
0	0	Discontinued	1	13	Remain more or less the same	7	88	Expand in terms of staff and services

19. Below is a list of possible problem areas you may have encountered in the operation of the Project in your school this year. Indicate how serious each had been using the following code: 1 = No problem; 2 = Slight problem; 3 = Moderately serious problem; 4 = Very serious problem

f	m	
7	1.7	Prompt start-up of the Project services at the beginning of the school year
5	1.4	Procedures for selection of pupils for the Project
7	1.6	Cooperation between bilingual classroom teachers and Project teachers
5	1.4	Amount of standardized testing
5	1.6	Amount or quality of diagnostic testing
4	2.5	Prompt action on referral of pupils to outside agencies
5	1.8	Effectiveness of educational prescription and remediation
4	1.8	Usefulness or completeness of pupil records in Project resource room
5	1	Professional competence of Bilingual Learning Disability Teacher
4	1	Professional competence of Project Bilingual Educational Assistant
5	1.2	Overall Project Organization
3	1	Professional competence of Project Psychologist
2	1.5	Effectiveness of Family Assistant
3	2	Project effectiveness in parental involvement
1	1	Other (Specify): Prompt feedback via weekly progress reports.

20. Which of the following best expresses your opinion about the Project this year?

f	%		
2	25	It is a vital addition to our school	Comment (Optional)
4	50	It is definitely an advantage to our school	
1	13	It is rather ineffectual in terms of my innitial expections	
1	13	No comment	

21. Please list below the names of any of your pupils that you would recommend that they <u>not</u> continue to participate in Project BUILD next year.

22. Please list below any suggestions or recommendations that you believe might improve the effectiveness of Project BUILD next year. (Use the back of the questionnaire if necessary.)

APPENDIX C

EDWARD J. CERVENKA, PH.D.
CONSULTANT IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS
617 WEST END AVENUE
SUITE 9-A
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024
(212) 724-0160

June 15, 1979

Dear Staff Member:

This questionnaire is part of the 1978-79 evaluation of your ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program. As a staff member, you have an important and immediate perspective on the Program. Your responses to this questionnaire are needed so that your viewpoints can be taken into account by the evaluation. Please answer all questions frankly. You are asked not to put your name on your questionnaire. Generally, your responses can be given by marking a check (✓) or a number in the appropriate blanks. Some questions will have more than one answer, or require you to mark in several places. At the end of the questionnaire you are asked to make recommendations for improving the Program. Also, additional space is given for any other comments.

A self-addressed envelope is provided in which to seal your completed questionnaire and return it either via the Bilingual Program Director or directly to the evaluators.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Title VII Program Evaluator

PROJECT BUILD: NYC DISTRICT 4 TITLE VII BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Questionnaire for Bilingual Program Staff

Code: f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; m = mean rating
3 = total number of questionnaire respondents

1. What is your position in the Bilingual Program?

f	%	
2	67	Teacher
1	33	Auxilary Personnel (Paraprofessional, Educational Assistant, Teacher Aide, etc.)
0	0	Technical or Resource Specialists (Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, Curriculum Specialist, etc.)
0	0	Administrative staff
0	0	Other (Please specify:_____)

2. Besides teaching, assisting with teaching, or administration, what are your main duties and responsibilities in the Program?

0	0	No other main duties in the Program
1	33	Curriculum and materials development
1	33	Staff training
0	0	Supervision
3	100,	Participating in regular staff meetings
2	67	Conferring with parents
0	0	Parent and adult community involvement activities
0	0	Counseling and guidance
0	0	Selection and placement of students
2	67	Testing and evaluating students
0	0	Planning of Program activities with Non-Program staff
0	0	Coordination of Program activities with Non-Program staff
0	0	Non-Program duties and activities (e.g. substituting in non-program classes)
0	0	Other(Please specify:_____)

3. How long have you been in your current position?

0	0	One year or less
2	67	Two years
1	33	Three to five years
0	0	Six years or more

4. How many years have you been in bilingual education or a related field?

0	0	One year or less
0	0	Two years
1	33	Three to five years
2	67	Six or more years

5. How much formal university training have you had in bilingual and/or special educatio

f	%	
0	0	None
0	0	1-2 courses (3-6 credit hours)
0	0	3-5 courses (9-15 credit hours)
0	0	6-10 courses (18-30 credit hours)
1	33	B.A. degree in bilingual and/or special education
0	0	M.A. degree in bilingual and/or special education
2	67	Beyond M.A. degree in bilingual and/or special education

6. In your opinion, how helpful was the pre-service(summer) training provided by the Program this year?

0	0	Very helpful
0	0	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
3	100	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

_____

7. In your opinion, how helpful was overall in-service training provided by the Program this year?

0	0	Very helpful
3	100	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
0	0	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

_____

8. In your opinion, how helpful were the special workshops (one day or short term) provided by the Program this year?

1	33	Very helpful
2	67	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
0	0	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

_____

_____

...of option, how helpful were the university courses provided under ESEA Title VII that you took this year?

f	%	
2	67	Very helpful
0	0	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
1	33	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments Clinic in individual testing and evaluation was particularly helpful.

List of courses enrolled in for 1978-79 Clinic in Individual Testing; Tests and Remedial Work for Handicapped;and Supervised Practicum.

10. Using the scale provided below and to the right), indicate in which subject areas of instruction you feel a need for additional professional preparation for bilingual education.

f	m	
2	1.5	English as a Second Language
2	1.5	Spanish as a Second Language
2	1	English Language Arts
2	1.5	Spanish Language Arts
2	1.5	Social Studies
2	1.5	Math
2	1.5	Science
3	4.3	Instruction and remediation for bilingual students with learning disabilities
3	4.3	Bilingual testing and measurement
3	3	Guidance for Bilingual Students
3	2	Improvement of Students' Self-concept through Bilingual Education
2	1	Promotion of Biculturalism through Bilingual Education
2	1	Teaching a Second Culture and Cultural Heritage
2	1	Teaching U.S.Culture and Cultural Heritage

Scale
5= Very Great
4= Substantial
3= Moderate
2= Slight
1= No need

11. Using the scales provided below indicate your feelings regarding current Program efficacy and Program Administrative Staff need for training or improvement for each of the management processes listed below:

Scale A: Current Program Efficacy	Scale B: Need for Training/Improvement
5= Very effective	5= Very great
4= Effective	4= Substantial
3= Ineffective	3= Moderate
2= Very ineffective	2= Slight
1= Insufficient information	1= Insufficient information
NA= Not applicable	NA= Not applicable

#11. continued

Current Efficacy f	Current Efficacy m	Processes/Activities	Need for Training/ Improvement f	Need for Training/ Improvement m
2	4	Planning and development (proposals, curricula, lessons)	3	3.7
2	4	Formulation and modification of goals and objectives	3	4
2	3.5	Leadership/Management Style	3	3.7
2	3.5	Decision making/Policy formulation	3	4
1	3	Delegation of authority	1	5
2	3.5	Budgeting (cost/work analysis and projection)	2	4.5
2	3.5	Coordination and organization	3	3.7
3	4	Communication with other Program staff	2	3.5
2	3.5	Communication non-Program staff	2	4
1	4	Scheduling of Program and classroom activities and events	3	3.3
2	3.5	Supervision and evaluation of personnel	3	3.7
1	3	Group problem-solving	3	4
2	3.5	Internal evaluation (including giving and receiving feedback)	3	4
1	3	Program grievance and "input" procedures	2	4.5
2	4.5	Training of personnel	3	3.7
1	3	Management of instruction (i.e. all factors affecting instruction other than teaching)	3	4
2	3.5	Language use policies	3	3
1	4	Supportive services	2	3.5
2	4	Procurement and management of supplies, materials and equipment	2	4
1	4	Space and time utilization and management	3	3.7
1	4	Office operation and efficiency	2	3.5

12. How are Program directives and news communicated and circulated among the staff? (You may mark more than one answer.)

f	%	
		Oral
3	100	Telephone conversations
3	100	Staff meetings
2	67	One-to-one conferences
1	33	Word of mouth/grapevine
0	0	Other(Please specify:_____)
		Written
1	33	Letters
2	67	Memos
1	33	Program proposal/Program modifications
0	0	Other: (Please specify _____)

13. How often did you confer or communicate, either formally or informally, with the A) Project BUILD Director and B) the Project Psychologist about the Program? (Put a check in each column)

A) Project Director		B) Project Psychologist		
f	%	f	%	
1	33	2	67	Very Frequently
2	67	1	33	Frequently
0	0	0	0	Infrequently
0	0	0	0	Very infrequently or never

14. Generally how useful and informative have staff conferences or meetings been in the Program this year?

0	0	Very useful and informative
2	67	Moderately useful and informative
0	0	Slightly useful and informative
1	33	Neither useful nor informative
0	0	Not applicable/No conferences or staff meetings held

15. In your opinion, Program need assessments, internal evaluations, modifications and other changes are initiated at which level? (Check one or more levels and indicate approximate percentage of changes at each level)

		Level	Percentage
1	33	Teachers	75 %
0	0	Paraprofessionals and aides	____ %
1	33	Project Psychologist	15 %
1	33	Project BUILD Director	10 %
0	0	School administrators	____ %
0	0	District administrators	____ %
0	0	Other (Please specify: _____)	____ %
			100%

16. In your opinion, how might Program selection and/or grouping procedures be improved? (Check as many answers as applicable)

0	0	Do not know
0	0	All right as they are
2	67	More effective or appropriate tests
2	67	More effective or appropriate assessment procedures
0	0	Changes in school policy, procedures, etc.
1	33	More input from bilingual classroom teachers
3	100	More observation of students in classrooms
3	100	More parental input
0	0	Other (Specify: _____)

Comments: _____

... to what extent did you participate in the process of selecting and grouping students for the program? (Check one)

f	%	
1	33	Not at all
2	67	To a slight extent
0	0	To some extent
0	0	To a substantial extent
0	0	Totally or almost totally responsible

18. To what extent were you satisfied with the procedures for selecting and grouping students for the program? (Check your appropriate grade level)

	Grades 1-2 f	Grades 1-2 %	Grades 3-4 f	Grades 3-4 %	Grades 5-6 f	Grades 5-6 %
Very satisfied	0	0	1	33	0	0
Satisfied	3	100	1	33	1	33
A little unsatisfied	0	0	1	33	0	0
Very unsatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0
No comment	0	0	0	0	2	67

19. To what extent did you participate in the "mainstreaming" of students from the Program? (Check one)

1	33	Not at all
0	0	To a slight extent
0	0	To some extent
1	33	To a substantial extent
1	33	Totally or almost totally responsible

20. To what extent were you satisfied with the criteria and procedures for mainstreaming students from the Program? (Check your appropriate grade level)

	Grades 1-2 f	Grades 1-2 %	Grades 3-4 f	Grades 3-4 %	Grades 5-6 f	Grades 5-6 %
Very satisfied	1	33	1	33	1	33
Satisfied	1	33	1	33	0	0
A little unsatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very unsatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0
No comment	1	33	1	33	2	67

21. In your opinion, how might exit or mainstreaming criteria and procedures be improved? (Check as many answers as applicable)

0	0	Do not know
0	0	All right as they are
2	67	More effective or appropriate tests
2	67	More effective or appropriate assessment procedures
0	0	Raising (i.e., making more rigorous) exit criteria
0	0	Lowering (i.e., making less rigorous) exit criteria
2	67	More input from bilingual classroom teachers
2	67	More observation of students in bilingual classrooms
1	33	More parental input
0	0	Other (Specify: _____)

Comments: _____

22. How adequate in quantity and quality have been the curriculum materials and other instructional aids available to you during the year?

f	%	Quantity	Quality	f	%
1	33	More than adequate/Very appropriate		1	33
2	67	Adequate/Appropriate		1	33
0	0	Inadequate/Inappropriate		1	33
0	0	Very inadequate/Very inappropriate		0	0

Comments: _____

_____

23. Were you provided with enough information regarding your teaching/remediation assignment, numbers of students, size of groups, diagnosed student needs, their levels of academic functioning, language ability, etc. to order sufficient and appropriate materials for 1978-79?

1	33	More than enough information
2	67	Adequate information
0	0	Inadequate information
0	0	Very little information
0	0	No information
0	0	Not applicable/Do not order materials, etc.

Comments: _____

_____

24. During the year, how effective was the Program generally in involving parents and other adult members of the community in the Program as well as in the education of their children?

0	0	Very effective
2	67	Effective
0	0	Somewhat ineffective
1	33	Very ineffective

Comments: _____

_____

25. Which statement below best sums up your overall opinion of the Program as it functioned in 1978-79?

2	67	It is a vital addition to the total school system.
1	33	It is definitely an advantage to our school system.
0	0	It could be an advantage if it were improved in certain ways.
0	0	It is more of a hindrance than as asset.

Comments: _____

_____

26. Would you like to see the Bilingual Program continued next year and in subsequent years?

f	%		f	%		f	%		f	%	
3	100	Yes, definitely	0	0	Yes	0	0	Possibly, if it can be improved	0	0	Not Sure	0	0	No

Comments: _____

27. Please use the space provided below, and on the back of this page if necessary, to give your recommendations for improving the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program next year (as well as possibly subsequent years) and also any additional information or opinions about strengths, weaknesses, problems, or accomplishments of the Program.

APPENDIX D

EDWARD J. CERVENKA, PH.D.
CONSULTANT IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS
617 WEST END AVENUE
SUITE 9-A
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024

June 5, 1979

Dear Parent:

This questionnaire serves as an important part of the evaluation of Project BUILD for the 1978-79 school year. As a parent of a child in the school, you have the most intimate perspective of the effect of the Project on your child's academic development. This questionnaire provides you with an opportunity to make recommendations with respect to the Project's operation and management.

We request that you not put your name on the questionnaire. Indicate your answer by marking a check (✓) in the proper blank. Take into account that some questions might have more than one answer. Please add your comments in the space provided.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please insert it in the envelope, seal it and have your child return it to his BUILD teacher. The evaluators will collect the sealed questionnaires at the school.

Thank you for your help and cooperation in carrying out this part of our evaluation.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Cervenka

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Evaluator of Project BUILD

PROJECT BUILD

Parent Questionnaire

Code: f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; m = mean rating
17 = total number of questionnaire respondents

Part A: Information about involvement

1. How many years has your child participated in the Project?

f	%		f	%	
1	6	Less than one year	6	35	Two years
4	24	One year	6	35	Three years

2. How many parents' and staff meetings for the Project have you attended?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
3	18	None	7	41	Two	3	18	Four or more
2	12	One	2	12	Three			

3. What type of communication did you receive this year from the Project? (You can mark more than one answer.)

0	0	None	3	18	Telephone calls
7	41	School bulletins or notices	3	18	Home visits by the Project staff (for example, by the Family Assistant)
7	41	Letters from the Project Director			
3	18	General announcements	2	12	Information on learning disabilities
9	53	Notes from the Project teachers	1	6	Other ~~speaking with teach re~~ _____

4. Do the Project staff communicate with you as much by written message as by oral message in your native language or a language that you understand well?

3	18	Rarely	0	0	Half of the time	9	53	Always
3	18	Sometimes	2	12	The majority of the time			

5. What type of Project activity did you participate in this year? (You can mark more than one answer.)

9	53	None	4	24	Member of the Parents Association
0	0	Program planning	2	12	Other volunteer assistant
1	6	Classroom volunteer	2	12	Cultural activities for holidays
0	0	Employed as a teacher's assistant	1	6	Other activity _____
0	0	Employed as a paraprofessional			_____

6. How many times have you had conferences with the BUILD teacher about your child's progress in the Project?

4	24	Never	0	0	Two	5	29	Four or more times
3	18	One	5	29	Three			

7. How many times have you observed the Project's classroom instruction?

11	65	Never	1	6	Two	3	18	Four or more times
2	12	One	0	0	Three			

Part B: Project Evaluation

8. I have noticed favorable changes in my child since he/she began attending the Project.

13	76	Agree	3	18	No opinion	1	6	Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

_____

9. My child's participation in the Project has promoted his/her studies in his/her other classes.

f	%		f	%		f	%	
11	65	Agree	3	18	No opinion	1	6	Disagree
						2	12	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

10. My child's attitude towards attending school and studying has improved as a result of his/her participation in the Project.

10	59	Agree	2	12	No opinion	2	12	Disagree
						3	18	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

11. Since my child has participated in the Project, his/her behavior at home has improved.

8	47	Agree	3	18	No opinion	2	12	Disagree
						4	14	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

12. My child has learned to read better since he/she has been in the Project.

13	76	Agree	1	6	No opinion	0	0	Disagree
						3	18	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

13. My child has learned to speak better since he/she has been in the Project.

13	76	Agree	3	18	No opinion	0	0	Disagree
						1	6	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

14. I am very pleased that my child participated in the Project.

14	82	True	0	0	False	3	18	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

15. Since my child has participated in the Project, I feel more comfortable about visiting the school.

10	59	True	2	12	False	5	29	No comment

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Part C: Recommendations

Mark one of the four answers in order to indicate your recommendations for each of the different aspects of the Project. Then add your recommendations for improving that aspect of the Project.

Instruction

16. In general, the quality of the Project's instruction seems to be:

f	%		f	%	
4	24	I do not have sufficient information	0	0	Average
12	71	Excellent	0	0	Poor
		Recommendations or comments:	1	6	No comment

Curriculum Materials

17. In general, the quantity and quality of the curriculum materials seem to be:

5	29	I do not have sufficient information	0	0	Average
9	53	Excellent	0	0	Poor
		Recommendations or comments:	3	18	No comment

Parent and Community Participation

18. In general, the parents' Project participation seems to be:

4	24	I do not have sufficient information	5	29	Average
7	41	Excellent	0	0	Poor
		Recommendations or comments:	1	6	No comment

Project Management

19. In general, the quality of Project management/supervision (including the selection of personnel) seem to be:

3	18	I do not have sufficient information	1	6	Average
11	65	Excellent	0	0	Poor
		Recommendations or comments:	2	12	No comment

20. Please use the back of this page to give whatever other recommendations you might have for improving the Project in the future, general comments or additional information concerning the Project's problems or accomplishments this year.

NAME_____ TEACHER_____

AGE_____ GRADE_____ SCHOOL_____ ADMINISTRATOR_____

A N S W E R B O O K L E T

PART A: WHAT I THINK ABOUT MYSELF!

DIRECTIONS

LISTEN WHILE THE TEACHER READS EACH QUESTION. CHOOSE THE PHRASE THAT SAYS WHAT YOU THINK. MARK THE PHRASE WITH A ☑. READ AND LISTEN CAREFULLY TO ALL OF THE FIVE CHOICES BEFORE MARKING YOUR ANSWER.

1. I THINK I AM	☐ VERY HAPPY ☐ A LITTLE HAPPY ☐ NEITHER HAPPY NOR SAD ☐ A LITTLE SAD ☐ VERY SAD
2. I THINK I AM	☐ VERY CLEAN ☐ A LITTLE CLEAN ☐ NEITHER CLEAN NOR DIRTY ☐ A LITTLE DIRTY ☐ VERY DIRTY
3. I THINK I AM	☐ VERY GOOD LOOKING ☐ A LITTLE GOOD LOOKING ☐ NEITHER GOOD LOOKING NOR UGLY ☐ A LITTLE UGLY ☐ VERY UGLY
4. I LIKE TO PLAY WITH OTHER KIDS. . .	☐ VERY MUCH ☐ A LOT ☐ NEITHER A LOT NOR A LITTLE ☐ A LITTLE ☐ NOT AT ALL

"Me, Myself and I: A Self Concept Test," Inventory of Socialization for Bilingual Childrer, 1968, Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D., Revised 1979.

APPENDIX F

PROCEDURES EMPLOYED IN BOND AND SINGER METHOD

The Bond and Singer or "historical regression" approach employs the following sequence of computations:

1. Pretest grade equivalent scores are obtained for each pupil.

2. "1" is subtracted from each pupil's G.E. score (since grade equivalent scores start at 1.0 and not at zero).

3. The figure obtained in step 2 is divided by the number of months the pupil has been in school to obtain a hypothetical (historical regression) rate of growth per month. One school year equals ten months; kindergarten months are ignored.

4. The number of months of ESEA Title VII treatment is multiplied by the historical rate of growth per month.

5. The figure obtained in step 4 is added to the pupil's pretest grade equivalent score.

6. The difference for significance between the group of pupils' "expected" or "predicted" posttest means and the actual posttest means, is tested with a dependent or correlated t test.